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electronic technology. Then --
    Q. And what -- I'm sorry.
        Did you graduate from that institution?
    A. Yes. It's called Pittsburg State
University in Kansas, yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. It's a small -- you know, community -- it's
not community college. It's about 10,000 students,
you know --
    Q. And --
    A. --'cause they have a relationship with
Taiwan. You know, they kind of assist the
school, --
    Q. I see.
    A. -- so I got something like assistantship.
That's why -- that's 1981.
    Q. And did you get a second BS or some other
degree --
    A. Master degree.
    Q. -- from the university?
    A. Master degree in technology, yeah.
    Q. I --
        MR. ELIASOPH: Make sure she finishes --
        THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.
        MR. ELIASOPH: -- her question --
electronic technology. Then --
Q. And what -- I'm sorry. Did you graduate from that institution?
A. Yes. It's called Pittsburg State
University in Kansas, yeah.
not community college. It's about 10,000 students,
you know --
Q. And --
A. --'cause they have a relationship with
Taiwan. You know, they kind of assist the
school, --
Q. I see.
Q. I see.
That's why -- that's 1981.
Q. And did you get a second BS or some other
degree --
A. Master degree.
Q. -- from the university?
A. Master degree in technology, yeah.
Q. I --
MR. ELIASOPH: Make sure she finishes --
THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.
MR. ELIASOPH: -- her question --
```
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        THE WITNESS: Okay.
        MR. ELIASOPH: -- before you start
    answering.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Sometimes you may anticipate where the
question is going or feel that you know that I'm
going to -- what l'm going to ask, but again for the
benefit of the reporter, as your counsel
indicated --
A. Okay.
Q. -- try to let me finish.
A. Sure.
Q. So you got a master's degree in technology
from the University in Kansas, correct?
A. Yeah -- yes. Yeah.
Q. And that was in 1981?
A. 1981, yes.
Q. Okay. Did you then immediately pursue
additional educational studies or did you start
working at that point?
A. That's around 1983 and I worked probably
summertime in Los Angeles. One of the -- they're
called All Computer -- a company called All
Computer, and I was salesperson.
I answer the phone and talk with the
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THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. ELIASOPH: -- before you start
answering.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
question is going or feel that you know that I'm
going to -- what I'm going to ask, but again for the
benefit of the reporter, as your counsel
dicated --
A. Okay.
Q. -- try to let me finish.
A. Sure.
Q. So you got a master's degree in technology
from the University in Kansas, correct?
A. Yeah -- yes. Yeah.
Q. And that was in 1981?
A. 1981, yes.
Q. Okay. Did you then immediately pursue additional educational studies or did you start working at that point?
A. That's around 1983 and I worked probably summertime in Los Angeles. One of the -- they're Computer, and I was salesperson.

I answer the phone and talk with the
client, you know, in a sale output like today.
Q. What's the -- how do you spell the name of the company?
A. It's called A, as Apple, I-I, like lucky,
lucky, All Computer, Incorporations.
Q. All --
A. I don't know they still have it or not.

It's been long time. It's summertime, yeah.
Q. And you started working for them in the summer --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- of 1981?
A. Yeah -- 19--- no, 1983. Because 1981
is -- went to the -- for the master's degree and a
couple years graduate, 1983 work in there, but it's very short time.

Then I -- I found a good job in Taiwan, so I went back to Taiwan and I pass certain criteria and a test to become associate professor with master degree at the time, you know. They're called Chihlee Institute of Technology, and I was an electronics instructors at the time.
Q. And what -- when you say you were an electronics instructor, is that --
A. It's electronic technology, you know. At
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that time it looked like -- for example, is a major
called electronics in the college and, you know, I
was teaching, like -- like an interface, a computer interface. So, for example, I -- one of class I teach is called, like -- you know -- like, a machine called an assembly language.

Assembly language is -- the label is between, you know, like -- like a machine call and apply label of a computer program language and they -- they can talk with the machine and a computer, you know, back and forth.

That's the class that I recall, but any -another class -- I also teach English, too.
Q. So let me ask a little bit more about the master's degree that you got in technology.
A. Okay.
Q. Did that involve courses in computer languages?
A. Just at that time I take some pascal and --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. At that time..
THE WITNESS: I took, like, one class
called pascal language -- you know, Pascal.
Q. Is that P-a-s-c-a-I?
A. -- c-a-l, yeah. Pascal.

It's the language after the four training.

A. American Society Institute -- I forgot the name exactly. ACIVS. There's inventory -- there's inventory control. American Inventory Control Society. We call something called CPIM.
Q. What does CPIM stand for?
A. P is production, I is inventory.
Q. Okay.
A. And I took -- I have to pass a
six-subject -- so usually one subject a year and
after they give a very big certificate, CPIM, a certificate.
Q. Okay.
A. It is a kind of the supply chain certificate, yeah. APICS -- I'm sorry APICS, yes.
Q. And did any of the study that you did to obtain that certification focus on supply chain issues in technology companies?
A. Can you re-address the question again.
Q. Did any of the study that you did to obtain that certification focus on supply chain issues in technology companies in particular?
A. So can I re-address the question and see -I want to make sure that I understand the question very well.
Q. Okay.
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A. So your questions asks me the -- the supply chain certification of the --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry?
THE WITNESS: "That you did to obtain that certificate for" --

MR. ELIASOPH: Could you break the question down into parts?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. It's kind of very
wide. I don't know how --
MS. MANTOAN: Sure.
THE WITNESS: -- to focus.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So you obtained a certification related to
supply chain management; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you had to study certain topics
in order to obtain that certification, right?
A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm.

MR. ELIASOPH: Remember to say "yes"
though.
THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. Okay.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Was that a "yes"?
A. Can you -- the last question, can you
repeat it?
Q. So there was a course of study that led to a test that led to the certification, correct?
A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did anything in that course of study focus
on supply chain issues specifically in technology
companies or the technology sector?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Aside from this supply chain certification do you have any other professional certifications or licenses?
A. No.
Q. Are you a member of any professional
organizations?
A. Statistical Association.
Q. Is that the American Statistical?
A. Yeah, American Statistical, yes.
Q. And how does one become a member of the

American Statistical Association?
Is it by invitation or is it something anyone can join?
A. Anyone can join if you like. You know, you can apply whenever you want, yeah.
Q. Okay. After completing your Ph.D. in 1994,
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have you taken any other educational courses, aside
from those connected to that supply chain certification?
A. Yeah. I took the Six Sigma Training.
Q. What is the Six Sigma Training?
A. Sigma is kind of quality -- control,
quality insurance.
Q. Why did you take that course?
A. Because at that time, you know, looking for
a job and I tried to, you know, make myself to know
a little bit -- a little bit more than, you know, so
I think, "Oh, that probably involved a lot of
statistics." That's why I thought "Okay, that's not
the" -- so l just joined.
Q. Did you ever seek an academic position after completing your Ph.D.?
A. No.
Q. Did you -- had you secured a job at the time you obtained your Ph.D.?

So when you graduated from the Ph.D.
program did you already have a job that you --
A. No. No.
Q. -- went to next? Okay.

So what was your first job after completing
the Ph.D.?

[^0]Q. Was there a particular product or group of products that you did technical support for?
A. You -- generally you cover anything -- any issues of computers.
Q. Any issues with Gateway's computers?
A. With Gateway computers, yes.
Q. Were you supporting software, or hardware, or both?
A. Okay. Can you re-dress the question
because it's very wide for me.
"Software, hardware," I don't know. It's
too wide for me, the question.
Q. So in your technical support role at Gateway were you fielding questions only about issues with the software, only about issues with the hardware, or with both kinds?
A. Both -- both -- both, yeah.
Q. Did you find that you were using your
statistical training as part of that job at Gateway
Computer?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever have a development role at Gateway Computer -- actually developing hardware or software?
A. After probably seven or eight months, and
one of the manager in marketing -- oh, no, in manufacturing, his name called Skip Post, he found my resume have statistics so he promote me into the
statistician -- statistician after probably seven
or -- I cannot recall exactly the months. They
promote me into the manufacturing statisticians, you know.

And -- but after probably couple, three months, there's a VP -- VP marketing, he saw my resume, so he moved me to marketing industry in marketing department, and the -- report to, you know, marketing department.

At that time I started the statistics through the forecasting, you know, something like that.
Q. So were any of those roles roles actually developing software or hardware?
A. No. I don't develop the software.
Q. Do you know how to develop software?
A. If it's basic level, it's okay, but high level, no. You know, they have..
Q. When did your employment at Gateway Computer end?
A. I don't know. It's either 1998 or 1999, before I moved to the Answerthink computer --

|  | Answerthink consulting company in Florida. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. So in 1998 or 1999 you left? |
| 3 | A. Yeah, 1998 or 1999. I cannot recall which |
|  | years. I cannot. |
|  | Q. Okay. And my question -- just so that I'm clear. |
| 6 |  |
| 7 | In 1998 or 1999 -- |
| 8 | A. Uh-hm. |
| 9 | Q. -- you left Gateway Computer and you moved |
|  | to a company called Answerthink consulting? |
|  | A. Answerthink consulting, yes. |
|  | Q. And again -- |
| 3 | A. Sure. |
|  | Q. -- try to let me get the whole question out |
|  | even if you can anticipate what the question will |
|  | be. |
|  | A. Okay, okay. |
|  | Q. Is that okay? |
|  | A. Yeah, it's okay. Thank you. |
|  | Q. And what -- what was your role at |
|  | Answerthink consulting? |
|  | A. I went out, installed software and |
|  | customized with their hardware. And I trained them |
|  | how to do the forecasting. |
| 25 | Q. What kind of forecasting? |
|  | Page 34 |
| A. Like the units -- the sales units, |  |
|  | manufacture units, is a customer demand, you know. |
| 3 | Q. So were the customers that you were working |
|  | with at Answerthink consulting businesses? |
|  | A. One is Ohio, one time is -- I think a cash |
|  | register, the first job. |
| 7 | And the second job in Canada, I forgot |
| 8 | which one, I forgot the name already. |
| 9 | Q. But it was for businesses, not individual consumers, correct? |
|  |  |
|  | A. Say again. |
|  | Q. So the work that you were doing for |
|  | Answerthink consulting, am I correct that the |
|  | clients you worked with were businesses as opposed |
|  | to, like, individual consumers using home computers, |
|  | or things like that? |
|  | A. No, it's a company. |
| 18 | Q. Company? |
|  | A. Uh-hm. |
| 20 | Q. Businesses? |
|  | A. Uh-hm. |
|  | Q. Okay. How long were you at Answerthink |
|  | consulting? |
|  | A. I think it's not too long. One year and |
|  | something, you know. Until 2002, I think -- 2001, |

Answerthink consulting company in Florida.
Q. So in 1998 or 1999 you left?
A. Yeah, 1998 or 1999. I cannot recall which
years. I cannot.
Q. Okay. And my question -- just so that I'm
clear.
In 1998 or 1999 --
A. Uh-hm
Q. -- you left Gateway Computer and you moved
A. Answerthink consulting, yes.
Q. And again --
A. Sure.
get the
be.
A. Okay, okay.
Q. Is that okay?
A. Yeah, it's okay. Thank you.
Q. And what -- what was your role at
Answerthink consulting?
A. I went out, installed software and
customized with their hardware. And I trained them
how to do the forecasting.
Q. What kind of forecasting?
A. Like the units -- the sales units,

2002, I think. Not too long. And -- yes.
Q. Have you ever been terminated from any position?
A. Yes. That's Answerthink.
Q. Okay.
A. They said -- okay, well, yes.
Q. What is your understanding of the reason you were terminated from Answerthink?
A. They told me because -- at that time, they call the year 2000 -- you know, the IT, is kind of the collapse. So they told me, you know, "If you want earlier" -- "early leave," they give me \$5,000, but if I still there until they figured out they want to retire me, then you got nothing. So I decided to just go -- got the \$5,000 and just go.
Q. Okay. To your -- to your understanding, have you ever been fired from any job?
A. No.
Q. So when you left Answerthink in 2001 or

2002, where did you next work?
A. USDA, government.
Q. Was this your first time working for the
U.S. --
A. Government.
Q. -- Government?
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A. Yes.
Q. And what was your first role at USDA?
A. FSIS.
Q. What does that stand for? Let me ask this, is that food safety and inspection service?
A. (Witness gives a thumbs up.)
Q. "Yes"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what did you do at FSIS?
A. Of course it's a statistics, you know, and analysis -- and analysis.
Q. Statistics and what? I'm sorry.
A. Statistical analyst.
Q. What kind of issues or questions were you analyzing there?
A. Just very variety. I cannot describe, you know. Variety of them.
Q. Can you give me some examples?
A. It's kind of quality -- you know, quality
control. Quality control, the data -- you know, and verify data. When they have data comes in, verify the data and write a report, data is consistent or not consistent.
Q. Was the data about food safety?
A. Yeah, about food safety or, like, they

| Page 37 | 1 labor entities? Page 39 |
| :---: | :---: |
| have -- onsite they didn't have slaughter data | 1 labor entities? |
| 2 onsite -- you know, onsite data. You know, onsite | 2 A. No, they -- no. To my understanding, no. |
| 3 data, they collect and sent to me and I do the -- to | 3 Q. So you said some of the policies they make |
| 4 verify, you know, and to -- like, a simple -- like a | 4 are for OFCCP; if I understood you correctly. Do |
| 5 descriptive analysis. | 5 they make policies for anything else? |
| 6 Q. Okay. So descriptive statistics? | 6 A. I should say, you know, I don't know them |
| 7 A. Descriptive statistics, yes. | 7 too much. |
| 8 Q. Were you doing hypothesis testing at FSIS? | Q. Okay. So as far as you know, your |
| 9 A. Very few, not always, you know. Basically | experience at the employment standards |
| 10 just they need a descriptive, you know, more than | 10 administration was limited to policy making for |
| 11 the -- hypothesis testing, no. | 11 OFCCP; is that right? |
| 12 Q. Were you doing regression analyses at FSIS? | 12 MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Misstates the |
| 13 A. No. | 13 testimony. |
| 14 Q. Did your role change at any time while you | 14 THE WITNESS: I don't know. |
| 15 were employed with FSIS? | 15 BY MS. MANTOAN: |
| 16 A. No. | 16 Q. What did you do at the employment standards |
| 17 Q. Okay. And how long were you at FSIS? | 17 administration? |
| 18 A. Two and a half. | 18 A. I--I do for OFCCP. |
| 19 Q. So I think that takes us to around 2005? | 19 Q. And what kind of work did you do? |
| 20 A. 2005, yeah. | 20 MR. ELIASOPH: Can I-- can I offer |
| 21 Q. Okay. | 21 something that -- |
| 22 A. Let's start with the -- okay. I'm sorry. | 22 I wonder if there's just some confusions. |
| 23 Q. And where were you next employed after | 23 There's been some reorganizations in the department |
| 24 FSIS? | 24 and he may be saying that OFCCP was under the |
| 25 A. DOL OFCCP -- | 25 employment standards administration umbrella. |
| PE REPORTER: DO -- Page 38 | Page 40 |
| THE WITNESS: DOL, department of labor. | 2 I'm not exactly clear, but I think the |
| 3 Yeah, DOL. Sorry. | 3 witness is a little confused, so maybe you can kind |
| BY MS. MANTOAN: | 4 of lay that out. |
| 5 Q. Did you spend any time employed at the | 5 BY MS. MANTOAN: |
| 6 employment standards administration? | 6 Q. Yeah, I'm just trying to see when you moved |
| 7 A. Yes, Ido. | 7 from FSIS to this different role in the department |
| 8 Q. Is that part of DOL? | 8 of labor. I'm trying to understand what that role |
| A. That's correct. | 9 was. |
| 10 Q. Is that part of OFCCP? | 10 So what did you do once you moved over to |
| 11 A. That's correct. | 11 the department of labor? |
| 12 Q. Is that the first place that you worked | 12 A. Statisticians -- |
| 13 after FSIS? | 13 Q. And what -- |
| 14 A. Yes. | 14 A. -- within OFCCP. |
| 15 Q. Okay. What is the employment standards | 15 Q. You did statistical work for OFCCP? |
| 16 administration? | 16 A. That's correct. |
| 17 A. Say again. | 17 Q. Okay. And what kind of statistical work? |
| 18 Q. What is the employment standards | 18 A. Regressions. |
| 19 administration? | 19 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry? |
| 20 A. Oh, they -- usually they make some policy | 20 THE WITNESS: Regression. |
| 21 for us to, you know, to follow or whatever, you | 21 BY MS. MANTOAN: |
| 22 know. | 22 Q. Is that regression? |
| 23 Q. They make policy for OFCCP? | 23 A. Regression analysis as a statistical |
| 24 A. Some of them, yes, uh-hm. | 24 regression analysis (sic). |
| 25 Q. Do they make policy for other department of | 25 Q. Is this the first position in your |
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employment history in which you regularly did
regression analyses?
    A. That's correct -- can I change? Can I
correct?
    Q. Yes
    A. When I was in the Answerthink, I do
regression every day too. Sorry about that.
    Q. What --
    A. We had to do the forecasting, you know,
demanding, yeah.
    Q. What kind of regression analyses were you
doing at Answerthink?
    A. I give example. For example, in Florida
they provide a lot -- they have import/export of
flowers. So flower is a for-sale product, so I need
to forecast the demanding next week or next two
weeks, you know, the demand -- forecast the demand
for the company.
    Q. Okay. So you were using regression
analysis at Answerthink to forecast product demand?
    A. Yes. And in Gateway, when I work in the
marketing department, I have to run the regressions
also.
    'Cause marketing -- for example, company
want me to -- like, forecasting the computer units,
```

short term and the long term, you know.
Q. So in that kind of forecasting regression
what would typically be, like, the dependent
variable and what would be the independent
variables?
A. Oh, dependent -- like, you know, units is
dependent.
Q. Uh-hm.
A. And, you know, the independent, such like the factors. They have many kind. They have a -similar GDP factors, or like, you know, the new computer train, right, or like the past or historical data, right? So they have a lot of factors. I cannot name all of them. You know, they have too many some time, yeah.
Q. Okay. Do the types of regression analyses that you were doing at the department of labor differ from the types of regression analyses that you had been doing in your prior work?
A. I don't know. As a statistician I think regression is a very -- is kind of standard for every kind of the applications, --
Q. Okay.
A. -- you know.
Q. And when you first moved over to the
department of labor were you actually running
regression analyses or were you involved in making policy about how the agency would run regression analyses?
A. No, I just simply run regressions.
Q. Were you a compliance officer?
A. No. I'm not CO. I'm not compliance officer.
Q. Were you in the national office when you moved to the department of labor?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that's in Washington, D.C.?
A. Washington, D.C., that's correct.
Q. Who did you first report to when you
started working at the department of labor?
A. You mean a who?
Q. Who did you first report to? Who was your supervisor when you first started at the department of labor?
A. Mike Sinclair.
Q. Okay.

THE REPORTER: Mike?
THE WITNESS: Sinclair.
MS. MANTOAN: Sinclair.
THE WITNESS: Sinclair.

BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. That's S-i-n-c-l-a-i-r?
A. S-i-n-c-l-a-i-r, that's correct.
Q. Okay. And how long did you report to Mike Sinclair?
A. I think he left -- I think he left 2007,

200--- I cannot recall. Sorry.
Q. Was it less than five years; do you think?
A. Yeah, less than five years.
Q. Okay. Where do you work today?
A. Same as usual, run regressions.
Q. Still at the department of labor?
A. That's correct.
Q. Still at OFCCP?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Are you still based in Washington, D.C.?
A. That's correct. But I'm located here -located in San Francisco.
Q. Oh. So now you're located in

San Francisco?
A. Yeah, in San Francisco.
Q. Has your role at OFCCP changed at any point between when you first began working there in 2005 and now?
A. No.
Q. Does your work typically involve doing
statistical analyses in connection with a compliance review?
A. Yes, uh-hm, it do.
Q. How many compliance reviews would you
estimate that you have done statistical work in connection with?
A. You mean the cases or the people?
Q. Cases.
A. Precisely I cannot recall it all, you know.

Precisely I cannot recall how many. It's many, but I don't know exactly, you know.
Q. So this is something maybe I should have mentioned at the outset. There are times when my questions may ask for something that you can't remember precisely, --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- and I don't want you to guess or
speculate, --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- but I am entitled to your best estimate.

So, by way of example, if I asked you to
tell me how long this (indicating) conference room
table that we're sitting at is you may not know
precisely but you could probably give me an
Page 46
estimate, right?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. By contrast, if I said "How long is my
dining room table?" --
A. Yeah, I understand.
Q. -- you couldn't -- you couldn't give me an estimate.
A. I understand.
Q. So with that understanding of an estimate,
can you give me an estimate of the number of
compliance reviews on which you've worked at OFCCP?
A. You mean how many cases I running?
Q. Correct.
A. I really -MR. ELIASOPH: It might be helpful if
you --
THE WITNESS: Because --
MR. ELIASOPH: -- can provide a range,
perhaps.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Is it more than a hundred?
A. More than a hundred, yes.
Q. Would it be more than 500 ?
A. You mean a -do?
that.
in that answer. directive usually is a 307. operative in 2013?
came, they had Directive 289.
Q. Okay.
cannot recall.
A. Uh-hm.
A. I think more than 500, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you have a standard practice or approach you use in doing statistical analyses in connection with compliance reviews?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, just I cannot -- I
cannot -- what means "standard practice"? You know,
Q. So I'm trying to understand more about your particular role on compliance reviews. You said you do statistical analyses, but can you give me some more detail or understanding about the work that you
A. Oh. They send the data to me and, of
course, they -- you know, everybody know the -- we
have a directive, so they're based on directive.
Send the datas to me and, you know, I have
to verify that you say dependent variable,
independent variable. I review the data is
consistent or not consistent; in effect is it
legitimate or not -- not legitimate, something like
Q. Okay. I want to break down a couple things

You said they're based on a directive. Is there a particular directive that you have in mind?
A. Okay. We have -- okay, and a recent
Q. Okay. Am I right that Directive 307 became
A. I cannot recall exact year, you know.
Q. Have there been multiple different
directives during your time at OFCCP that govern how you structure statistical analyses?
A. What do you mean "multiple directives"?
Q. Have there been different ones over time?
A. Yes. They have -- long time ago, when I
A. And this is 307. And then another one I
Q. Okay. You said that in running these
analyses you have to verify the dependent variable.
Q. What did you mean by that?
A. Oh. Like it's a base pay, or a total pay,
or bonus, something like that; and the other
dependent variables have some status issues or not
status issues.
Q. So what is your practice with regard to determining which dependent variable to study?
A. Oh, for example, it's -- for example, it's
across over many periods or not across many periods.
If it's just one period or couple periods,
the status method is different.
Q. Okay. But first l'm talking about the type
of dependent variable, so let's take a
compensation --
A. Oh. Okay.
Q. Let me just finish the question.
A. Sorry.
Q. In a compensation case base pay versus
total comp versus bonus, --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- how do you decide which dependent
variable you're going to study?
A. I don't understand. Maybe it's too
generic? I don't know your question. Can you --
Q. So the dependent variable in a compensation
case is some measure of pay, correct?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. How do you decide which measure of pay
you're going to study, whether it's base pay, or
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A.
you know, they went to the basement -- base pay or
the total compensations, and I will make a good
judgment, you know, see is it -- can we have enough
legitimate factor to run with this or -- the base or
total compensation?
Q. Okay. So I'm going to come back to the
phrase "legitimate factor," which you've used a
couple times, but when you say you have to use
judgment to determine if you have enough of those
factors, what do you mean?
What kind of -- is it a numeric threshold, or what do you mean by determine if we have enough factors to use a different measure of pay?
A. For example, if they want me to do the total compensations -- and total compensation may include base pay, may include shift difference, or it may -- may include, like, a company compensation policy or plan, right, like strategic, you know, but I cannot find any factor to integrate the pay so I cannot do.
Q. You mean you can't find data on shift differential or something; is that what you mean?
A. Or like a description -- a distribution

1 pay. Some company, they provide their distribution
2 pay, but some, they don't.
3 If I don't have company distribution pay I cannot do some analysis.
Q. You can't do an analysis of distribution
pay if you don't have distribution pay? That's what you're saying?
A. For example -- for example, if the total
pay they have bonus component in there, and the --
and the factors, right, they don't have any factor
that can explain the role of bonus component then I
say "I cannot do."
Q. What do you mean by factor that explains the bonus component?
A. For example, year's of experience, right --
Q. Uh-hm.
A. -- can explain the base compensation, right? You work more years, your base compensation will be more, right?

So if I --
Q. Are you saying that's true in all -- in all cases?
A. Yeah. It's -- normally. Standard -normally will do that, yeah, but of course they call the reverse -- you know, if they have a reverse
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trend then we probably have to collect them -- you
know, more legitimate factors, so...
Q. Okay. When you say -- you've used the
phrase "legitimate factor" a couple times and I want
to make sure I understand what you mean when you use the phrase "legitimate factor."

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

She's just asking what you mean by the term.

THE WITNESS: It's kind of a -- the factors can connect -- interplete (sic), you know, or evaluate the pay. They're reasonable -- reasonable.

MS. MANTOAN: Yeah, I--
THE REPORTER: The factors can connect...
THE WITNESS: Can explain the pay reasonably -- logically, reasonably, you know.

For example, I cannot use a GDP to explain our base salary, you know, it's nothing to do with that.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. You're saying you wouldn't use the United

States' GDP as a factor to explain base pay at a particular company?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is that what you're saying?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. In any particular compliance
evaluation how do you go about determining which
factors can explain pay at that particular company?
A. Okay. Let me -- okay. Usually, you know,
we -- the directive, they give us --
MR. ELIASOPH: So, I'm just going to object
to the extent that the question calls for him
explaining information that other people do and he'd
be speculating on it.
You can only testify about what your role is or if you know something else.
THE WITNESS: Uh-hm.
Okay. My role -- actually, you know, we base on the directive, which the company -- they provide 12 or 13 or 14 factors. So we just base on the company providing the factors to do the analysis.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So anything a company provides you put into your analysis?
A. Yes -- yeah.
Q. What did you mean by "legitimate factors" then?
A. Is very -- "legitimate" is kind of very
wide, you know, sometime incorrect, you know, they
are tentative, you know?
Q. What was that last word? I'm sorry.
A. "Tentative."

Like the data is not -- is not consistent, or they have some type errors in there, then I don't use it, you know.
Q. Okay.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. In a typical compliance review, where
you're doing a regression analysis, are you actually
the person that determines which factors to include in the regression?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Who is typically the person who determines which factors to include in the regression?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: It can involve many, many
kind of people. I don't know, maybe from the district. I really don't know. I can't recall all of them.
I//

BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. How are you typically informed -- let me strike that.

Are you -- in a typical compliance review are you told that you that should structure your model in a particular way, use a particular dependent variable and a particular set of control factors?
A. I just use the standard procedures the
directive say -- the 12, 13, or 14 factors the company provide to us usually.

And after that -- and maybe some people reviewed, some -- another statistician or someone in the district, you know, they do another methods -- I don't know.
Q. So let me ask it this way: In a typical compliance review, how do you first become involved in the compliance review?

Like, do you receive a phone call from someone, or an e-mail, asking you to do something?

MR. ELIASOPH: To the extent we're talking about communications, I'm willing to allow some discussion of generalized if we agree that's not in any way waiving our deliberative process privilege once -- in case you start asking about specific
communications.
MS. MANTOAN: I understand that you have made a deliberative privilege process objection --

MR. ELIASOPH: Well, --
MS. MANTOAN: -- and I really just am
trying to understand how the -- the facts about how he becomes involved.

MR. ELIASOPH: Well, I need your agreement that you're not later going to argue by allowing generally, like, how he does -- you know, how things get started -- you know, you're not going to argue that we have now waived the deliberative process privilege with respect to specific communications.

MS. MANTOAN: Let's go off the record and take a break so I can -- we can make sure we understand each other.

MR. ELIASOPH: Uh-hm.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record.

The time is 10:33 a.m.
(Short recess was taken from 10:33 a.m.
until 11:21 a.m.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record.

The time is 11:21 a.m.

|  | BY MS. MANTOAN: Page 57 |  | MS. MANTOAN: Desk. Page 59 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. Good morning again, Dr. Leu. | 2 | THE WITNESS: Desk auditors. |
| 3 | A. Good morning. | 3 | And we also have expert consultant come to |
| 4 | Q. So we're back on the record here, -- | 4 | us to train for a compensation pay, 2006, 2007 -- I |
| 5 | A. Yeah. |  | cannot recall exactly the date. |
| 6 | Q. -- and we took a longer than usual break. | 6 | BY MS. MANTOAN: |
| 7 | I believe counsel for both sides has now had a | 7 | Q. Do you recall the name of that person who |
| 8 | chance to read the order issued today by the ALJ, | 8 | provided training on compensation? |
| 9 | the order granting Defendant Oracle's motion to | 9 | A. No, I cannot recall. |
| 10 | compel Plaintiff OFCCP to designate and produce | 10 | Q. Do you recall if it was a man or a woman? |
| 11 | 30(b)(6) witnesses. | 11 | A. No, I cannot recall. I'm sorry. |
| 12 | Dr. Leu, have you ever helped to design a | 12 | Q. And, as you sit here today, what -- if |
| 13 | compensation or pay system? | 13 | anything, do you recall from that expert training on |
| 4 | A. Design a compensation pay -- no. | 14 | compensation? |
| 15 | Q. Okay. Have you ever offered an expert | 15 | A. They just tell you how to, you know, |
| 16 | opinion in court? | 16 | collect related datas |
| 17 | A. No. | 17 | now, run a model and how to check the model, like a |
| 18 | Q. Have you ever offered an expert opinion | 18 | alidation of the model. |
| 9 | before the Office of Administrative Law Judges of | 19 | Q. You said "validation of the model"? |
| 20 | the Department of Labor? | 20 | A. Validation of the model. |
| 21 | A. No. | 21 | Q. So is it -- is it fair to say that you were |
| 22 | MR. ELIASOPH: Object -- objected -- | 22 | taught a standard way to run compensation models at |
|  | objection. Vague as to "expert opinion." | 23 | that training? |
| 24 | BY MS. MANTOAN: | 24 | A. I cannot say. As I understand, it's just |
| 25 | Q. Have you ever been qualified as an expert | 25 | outside consulting company come to us. And usually, |
|  | ffer Page 58 |  | Page 60 |
|  | to offer an opinion before the administrative law |  | at that time, we -- we have -- almost have every |
| 2 | judges as far as you know? | 2 | year of -- like a training of some type. |
| 3 | MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for a | 3 | Q. Sorry. What was -- can you say that again? |
| 4 | legal conclusion. |  | A. They have the kind of training, but they |
| 5 | You -- |  | don't tell us, "This is the standard methods or not |
| 6 | MS. MANTOAN: | 6 | tandard methods," no. |
| 7 | Q. So do you know if you've ever been | 7 | Q. Okay. Have you received any training at |
| 8 | qualified as an expert in front of the Office | 8 | the department of labor on conducting compensation |
| 9 | Administrative Law Judges? |  | analyses since that 2006, 2007 training you just |
| 10 | A. I don't know what it means -- how do you | 10 | described? |
| 11 | define a -- "qualify"? | 11 | A. Yes. |
| 12 | Q. Do you recall ever going through a process | 12 | Q. Can you tell me about that additional |
|  | where attorneys asked you questions about your | 13 | training? |
| 14 | expertise and background and then formally asked an | 14 | A. Usually that's called -- they released a |
| 15 | ALJ to deem you an expert? | 15 | Directive 307, and a 307 will -- you know, that will |
| 6 | A. No. | 16 | how us how to create the PAG for statistical |
|  | Q. Okay. When you first began -- well, strike | 17 | analysis. |
| 18 | that. | 18 | THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Create the... |
| 19 | At any time since coming to work for the | 19 | THE WITNESS: PAG, like, a pay analysis |
| 20 | department of labor have you received any training | 20 | group -- P -- p-a-y, analysis group. |
| 21 | on conducting statistical analyses? | 21 | BY MS. MANTOAN: |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 | Q. And what is your understanding of what |
| 23 | Q. What training is that? | 23 | Directive 307 says about how to create pay analysis |
| 24 | A. Like, you know, we have desk auditors. | 24 | groups? |
| 25 | THE REPORTER: I'm sorry? Ex-audit? | 25 | MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it |


|  | Page 61 | Page 63 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | calls for legal conclusions. | 1 or sometime we'll be -- I don't know, RD were |
| 2 | THE WITNESS: Oh, it's usually -- it's more | 2 involved, too, you know, sometimes. |
|  | 3 flexible, this -- well, as long as you think the | 3 Q. But on the reviews where you've worked, |
|  | 4 group is comparable, you know, based on their -- you | 4 you, as the statistician, aren't actually the one |
|  | 5 know, the job group or job title or -- job group or | 5 who decides which employees should be grouped |
|  | job title. | 6 together in a typical case; is that accurate? |
| 7 | MS. MANTOAN: Job group or job title. | 7 A. Usually I don't decide, no. They decide. |
| 8 | MR. ELIASOPH: Job group or job title. | 8 Q. Okay. And in a typical review where you |
|  | BY MS. MANTOAN: | 9 are the statistical analyst, am I correct that you |
| 10 | 10 Q. In a typical compliance review, where you | 10 do not decide which factors to control for in the |
|  | 1 are the statistician working on the review, are you | 11 model? |
|  | 2 the person who determines what pay analysis groups | 12 A. Yeah, basically that is, unless I found |
|  | 3 to do or are you told by someone else what pay | 13 something not legitimate, like they have only |
|  | 4 analysis groups to use? | 1450 percent data, right, then I tell them "I cannot |
|  | 5 A. Basically I was told. | 15 use this one." |
|  | 6 Q. Okay. | 16 Q. Okay. But l'm not sure I asked a clear |
|  | 1 A. Yeah. | 17 question, so let me just make sure it was clear. |
|  | 8 Q. Okay. | 18 A. Yeah. |
| 19 | 9 A. And this I-- like, I found this, you know, | 19 Q. Am I correct that typically the person |
|  | 0 legitimate factor then I will tell them | 20 deciding which factors to control for in a |
|  | 1 this one." | 21 statistical model you're going to run is someone |
| 22 | 2 They decide, you know, I -- for example, | 22 other than you? |
|  | 3 like, if you have time in company, usually that is | 23 A. Uh-hm. |
|  | 4 legitimate, but only have -- 50 percent people have | 24 Q. Correct? |
|  | 5 that TIC, or time in -- time in company. So I tell | 25 A. Yeah, but sometime I also -- if, like -- to |
|  |  | Page 64 |
|  | 2 Q. So I want to distinguish | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | questioning and I | 2 |
|  | questioning -- and I guess throughout the session | 3 also tell them, you know, like my opinion, but they |
|  | 4 today, between determining which employees are | 4 will make the final decisions, yeah. |
|  | 5 comparable and then determining what factors could | 5 Q. What standard do you apply when you're |
|  | 6 differentiate pay among those employees. | 6 looking at whether a pool of employees actually |
|  | Do you understand that distinction? | 7 compares people who are comparable? |
|  | A. PAG is -- we decide, you know, the | 8 A. You mean a criteria to put them together? |
|  | 9 comparable pool, right, then we can perform the | 9 Q. Correct. |
|  | 0 regression on the pool. | 10 A. Oh, okay. |
|  | 1 Q. And when you perform the regression on the | 11 MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague. |
|  | 2 pool you introduce certain factors to control for? | 12 THE WITNESS: You mean decide the pool? |
|  | 3 A. Yeah, the factor usually provided by the | 13 MS. MANTOAN: Correct. |
|  | 4 contractor. | 14 BY MS. MANTOAN: |
|  | 5 Q. Okay. So using that distinction that we | 15 Q. What standard do you use when you're |
|  | 6 talked about -- on the one hand deciding which | 16 looking and determining whether that pool contains, |
|  | 7 employees to group together and then on the second | 17 in your words, comparable employees? |
|  | 8 hand deciding what factors to control for within | 18 A. The -- |
|  | 9 that group, in a typical compliance review where you | 19 MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it |
|  | 0 are doing the statistical analysis who decides -- if | 20 calls for speculation. |
|  | 1 you know, who decides which employees to group | 21 BY MS. MANTOAN: |
|  | 2 together in an analysis? | 22 Q. Well, I'm asking what standard you use. So |
|  | 3 A. Usually district office or managers -- or | 23 you said you do an assessment of the employees |
|  | 4 the managers. For example, we have, like, a DORO, | 24 groupings to determine whether you agree that they |
|  | 5 the district operations managers in San Francisco, | 25 are comparable, correct? |


|  | verlaping speakers.) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | erlapping speakers. | 1 today you just don't have any understanding of |
|  | MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Misstates prior | 2 the word comparable means in the context we've been |
|  | 3 testimony. | 3 discussing? |
|  | BY MS. MANTOAN: | 4 A. Uh, okay -- |
| 5 | 5 Q. Was I correct? | 5 MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and |
|  | 6 A. Say again? | 6 answered. Argumentative. |
| 7 | Q. Am I correct that you typically -- even if | THE WITNESS: When you say "asked and |
|  | 8 you're given a grouping of employees, do your own | 8 answered" means I have to ask or answer? |
|  | 9 assessment of whether you agree that the employees | 9 MR. ELIASOPH: No, you -- l'm stating |
|  | 0 in that grouping are comparable; is that correct? | 10 objections for the record. |
|  | 1 A. Comparable? | 11 THE WITNESS: Okay. |
|  | 2 Q. Comparable. | 12 MS. MANTOAN: Yeah. |
|  | 3 A. Comparable, okay. | 13 MR. ELIASOPH: With that objection what I'm |
| 14 | 4 MR. ELIASOPH: Asked and answered. | 14 saying is I believe that the question has been asked |
| 15 | 5 THE WITNESS: Hmm, okay. "Do your own | 15 and you've already provided an answer. |
|  | 6 assessment of whether you agree." | 16 THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 17 | 7 No, usually I don't provide any assessment. | 17 MS. MANTOAN: Yeah, unless counsel |
|  | 8 I just sometime give opinion on that. | 18 instructs you not to answer, generally objections |
| 19 | 9 BY MS. MANTOAN: | 19 are just for the record and you would continue to |
|  | 20 Q. Okay. So you, at times, offer your opinion | 20 answer the question. |
|  | 1 as to whether the grouping in fact contains | 21 So, let me ask a simpler question... |
|  | 2 comparable employees, -- | 22 BY MS. MANTOAN: |
|  | 3 A. Yeah, | 23 Q. What does the word "comparable" mean for |
|  | 4 Q. -- correct? | 24 you -- mean to you in the context of -- |
|  | 5 A. -- because the 307 is very clear, you know, | 25 A. Okay. |
|  | everybody can use. They can use -- I think they -- | 1 Q. -- employee groupings for pay analysis Page 68 |
|  | 2 the district, they use very well, you know. | 2 purposes? |
|  | 3 Q. Okay. And when -- when you're offering | 3 A. Okay, for example, right, if you work in |
|  | your views, on whether employees in a grouping are | 4 management administrations and I work as engineer, |
|  | 5 comparable, what standard or definition of | 5 then we don't work together because it's, like -- |
| 6 | comparable are you using? | 6 you know, not comparable. You are an engineer and |
|  | A. Like I say, they have directive in the 307 . | 7 you are in management administration. They cannot |
|  | I cannot recall the detail of them, you know, but I | 8 group together. |
| 9 | know it's in the Directive 307. | 9 Q. And why wouldn't you put those groups |
|  | 0 Q. So I will show you Directive 307 later | 10 together in the example you just gave? |
| 11 | 1 today -- | 11 A. Why? Why we don't put altogether? |
|  | 2 A. Yeah. | 12 Q. Yes. |
| 13 | 3 Q. -- but I'm wondering, as you sit here | 13 A. Because it's kind of very bad, you know. |
| 14 | 4 today -- | 14 See, you (indicating) engineer and you are |
| 15 | 5 A. Uh-hm. | 15 (indicating), like, management, so usually |
| 16 | 16 Q. -- do you have a general understanding of | 16 management -- the compensation pay usually they have |
| 7 | 7 the standard of comparability that you use when | 17 the rules, pay for the manager and then pay for -- |
| 18 | 8 you're determining whether a grouping contains | 18 they have -- for example, manager, they have -- |
| 19 | 9 comparable employees? | 19 they're called, like, an MBO, manager by objective |
| 20 | 0 MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Confusing. | 20 pay, right, but the engineer, they don't have that |
| 21 | 1 Vague. Misstates prior testimony. | 21 kind of pay. And mainly engineer is kind of an |
| 22 | THE WITNESS: I -- I don't know how to | 22 individual contributor, so we should not put them |
|  | 3 answer this question very well, so. | 23 together. That's -- you know, that's comparable, |
| 24 | 4 BY MS. MANTOAN: | 24 yes. |
|  | 5 Q. So is it your testimony that sitting here | 25 And the more details/definitions should be |

in the 307, so I cannot --
Q. In your understanding, are comparable
employees those who are doing similar work?
A. Same, like if they assume same opportunity with the same skills or knowledge, you know.
Q. Would whether employees have the same responsibilities or not be relevant in your view to whether they're comparable?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it
calls for a legal conclusion.
Objection to the extent it calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: So I cannot answer this questions because I don't make this policy or -- you
know. I'm just doing regression analysis and this
one for a group, you know, is not my job.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. But you did testify earlier that you also
look at groupings and make your own -- develop your own opinion as to whether or not they're comparable, correct?
A. Yes.

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Misstates prior testimony.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I -- I did. I see
their PAG, but usually I don't change anything.
It's just my opinion, that's it. I don't -- you
know, I don't have the right, or whatever, change anything there.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Has anyone ever instructed you or informed you that you don't have the right to change pay analysis groups for statistical analyses you're asked to run?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So why do you say that you don't
have the right to change anything with respect to the employee groupings in a statistical analyses you're asked to run?
A. That's my personal feel. I'm not manager -- I'm not management so I don't -- and I just -- for statistical -- you know, my job, is just kind of my opinion, my thinking. This is my job, do like this.

And, by the way, create a PAG need a company -- a contractor's compensation pay, and usually I don't have that. The CO, they collect the information. So they put CO -- they have a district director. They control information. They don't give to me, so I cannot decide anything.
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## Q. Okay.

A. Yeah. But because I read the 307 -- so I
have some knowledge, you know, if they're really way
off I just provide some opinion, that's it.
Q. So tell me if this is -- is correct, 'cause

I want to make sure I'm understanding you.
Is your role -- typical role in a
compliance review just to take the pay analysis
groups and the pay factors that you've been told to
run and simply do the mathematical statistical work on that exact pay analysis group using those exact factors?
A. Pretty much that, yeah -- pretty much that,
yeah.
Q. Okay. Okay. When I asked you about any training that you've received you mentioned desk audit tools, if I understood you correctly.

What did you mean by "desk audit tools"?
A. It's -- before a regression we don't have individual data so the district will, you know, check the initial, you know, neutral or not neutral, you know, for the pay.
Q. Sorry. I don't understand what that means.
A. Okay. So desk audit, you know,
compensation analysis is just -- basically just
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gender race and then the salary. They don't have
individual data -- like individual -- individual
data, --
Q. Okay.
A. -- so we cannot perform the regression analysis.
Q. So a desk audit --
A. It's before a -- before a regression analysis, so...
Q. Okay. So, in your experience, the desk audit analysis is typically just average pay differences by gender or race?
A. Yeah, the average difference. You know, I got trained, but basically I don't involve that part. I just involve the regression analysis.
Q. Okay. But you've had training on these desk audit tools; is that right?
A. Yeah, yeah, I did -- I did have.
Q. Does the acronym DAC mean anything to you?
A. Huh?
Q. DAC, is that the name of a program or...
A. DAC? Oh, yeah. That's a desk audit. DAC,
that's desk audit, I believe, yeah.
Q. Is that --
A. Maybe I'm wrong.


```
process privilege with respect to this witness.
    MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
    Q. Have you ever worked on an OFCCP compliance
review for Oracle?
    A. Can you repeat again?
    Q. Have you ever worked on an OFCCP compliance
review for Oracle?
    A. Yes, for regression part.
    Q. How many compliance reviews have you worked
on for Oracle?
    A. How do you measure "how many"? How do you
measure?
    Q. How many different locations?
    A. Sorry, I cannot recall.
    Q. Can you give me your best estimate?
    A. 'Cause I have several -- I don't know,
several and another company, too, but I don't know.
    Q. Would it be more than 10?
    A. When you count -- when you count -- when
you count you measure each individual regressions or
all locations?
        You know, the question is not very clear.
    Q. So am I correct that at -- it's often the
case that an OFCCP compliance review will be
conducted on an establishment basis by a location,
correct?
    A. Yeah.
    Q. Okay. So I'm wondering how many different
establishment compliance reviews for Oracle you have
worked on?
    MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and
answered.
    THE WITNESS: I cannot remember exact
number, you know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
    Q. Do you estimate that it's more than 10?
    A. You mean more than }10\mathrm{ location?
    Q. Correct?
    A. No.
        MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
    Q. Is it more than five locations.
        MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
        THE WITNESS: I still cannot -- I still
    cannot recall exact number, you know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
    Q. Okay. But fewer than then ten, correct, as
far -- as best you can recall?
    A. Fewer than 10, okay, yeah.
process privilege with respect to this witness.
MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Have you ever worked on an OFCCP compliance review for Oracle?
A. Can you repeat again?
Q. Have you ever worked on an OFCCP compliance review for Oracle?
A. Yes, for regression part
Q. How many compliance reviews have you worked
on for Oracle?
A. How do you measure "how many"? How do you measure?
Q. How many different locations?
A. Sorry, I cannot recall
Q. Can you give me your best estimate?
A. 'Cause I have several -- I don't know,
several and another company, too, but I don't know
Q. Would it be more than 10 ?
A. When you count -- when you count -- when
you count you measure each individual regressions or
all locations?
You know, the question is not very clear.
Q. So am I correct that at -- it's often the
case that an OFCCP compliance review will be
conducted on an establishment basis by a location, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So I'm wondering how many different
establishment compliance reviews for Oracle you have
worked on?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and
answered.
THE WITNESS: I cannot remember exact
number, you know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Do you estimate that it's more than 10 ?
A. You mean more than 10 location?
Q. Correct?
A. No.

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Is it more than five locations.

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I still cannot -- I still
cannot recall exact number, you know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. But fewer than then ten, correct, as
far -- as best you can recall?
A. Fewer than 10, okay, yeah.
Q. And did you work on a compliance review for Oracle's headquarters' location in Redwood Shores?
A. Where?
Q. In Redwood Shores, the headquarters' location?
A. Redwood and --
Q. Redwood Shores is the name of the city.
A. Ah, yes, yes.
Q. It's also the headquarters.
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you recall if that headquarters'
review was the first compliance review of Oracle in which you were involved?
A. I don't remember if it was the first one or not first one, but I -- I think so. I -- I involved that one, yeah, but I don't know if it's the first one or second or third one. I don't know.
Q. Okay. What was your involvement with the OFCCP compliance review of Oracle's headquarters' location?
A. Oh, this one, I just do the regressions from -- I think it's a -- management, they sent me the database and provide me factors to do the regressions.
Q. When you say "management" who are you
referring to?
A. It's Janette Wipper.

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry?
MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Janette Wipper?
A. Janette Wipper.
Q. That's W-i-p-p-e-r; is that correct? Okay.

So with respect to the Oracle's
headquarters' compliance review, Ms. Wipper sent you
a data file and sent you instructions on which
factors to include in your regression; is that correct?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. This is deliberative process privileged information. I'm instructing the witness not to answer.

MS. MANTOAN: So, I disagree in light of today's order, just for the record, which says that the factual basis for the statistical model, including what individuals are told about what to include, or not, is not something that's privileged when the results of the statistical model are made public. True, the order is about the SAC, but the NOV was made public and included in the original complaint in this action, so I disagree with that legal -- with that -- with that interpretation of
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\begin{tabular}{lc}
\hline 1 & the privilege. \\
2 & Are you still instructing the witness not \\
3 & to answer? \\
4 & MR. ELIASOPH: I am. I'll just state for \\
5 & the record that we have only had a limited \\
6 & opportunity to really consider and review the \\
7 & opinion. I did appreciate the time to read the \\
8 & opinion. I do think from the face of the opinion \\
9 & it's specifically discussing matters related to the \\
10 & second amended complaint. \\
11 & And with respect to a 36 -- 30(b)(6) \\
12 & deposition, the opinion goes into detail about how \\
13 & privileges may be preserved and I believe we are \\
14 & squarely within this decision in producing Mr. Leu \\
15 & today and allowing him to testify on nonprivileged \\
16 & aspects of this case. \\
17 & MS. MANTOAN: And to be clear, he's not \\
18 & being produced as a 30(b)(6). \\
19 & MR. ELIASOPH: He is not. \\
20 & MS. MANTOAN: Correct. Okay, well, I'm \\
21 & going to -- I'm going to leave the deposition open \\
22 & at the end so that we can resolve those issues, and \\
23 & it's possible I may need to call Dr. Leu back \\
24 & depending on the resolution of those -- of those \\
25 & issues.
\end{tabular}
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BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. As you sit here today do you -- what do you
recall about the regression model that you ran for Oracle's headquarters' location, if anything?

MR. ELIASOPH: So, you can answer to the extent you're not revealing deliberative information, meaning communications and conversations you had leading up to the decision.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Can you repeat your question again, please?
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. What do you recall about the regression model that you ran for Oracle's headquarters' location, if anything?
A. It's very good questions, but this is --
it's very long time ago. I really cannot just
memorize right away, you know.
MR. ELIASOPH: Thank you.
THE REPORTER: Exhibit --
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE REPORTER: -- Exhibit 2.
(Exhibit 2 was marked for identification.)
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. And will you take a moment to look at this, Dr. Leu.

Just for the record, Exhibit 2 is a
document bearing Bates No. DOL 1395 to DOL 1406.
And my first question for you, Dr. Leu, is
just going to be: Have you ever seen this document before?

MR. ELIASOPH: And you can take your time
to look at it --
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. ELIASOPH: -- to make sure you know what it is.

Do you know what the question is? Do you remember?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. It's -BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Have you seen this before?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Can you flip to Attachment A, which if you look at the numbers in the lower right-hand corner it starts at No. 1404.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. And my question is whether you've seen Attachment A before.
A. No.
Q. Okay. Do you have an understanding of what a Notice of Violation is?

\section*{A. No.}
Q. Okay. So this -- if you turn back to the first page of this document, it's dated March 11th, 2016.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. And my question for you is whether the
statistical analysis for Oracle's headquarters'
location -- that you testified about before, whether
you ran that before or after March 11th, 2016.
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation. Confusing.

THE WITNESS: I believe that I run it before.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. Did you ever run any statistical analysis for Oracle's headquarters' location after this Notice of Violation?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: I -- I really cannot recall, you know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. On how many different occasions did you run a statistical analysis for Oracle's headquarters' location?
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & A. When you say "occasions," what -- the time? 85 & & And indicating in the e-mail that "the Page 87 \\
\hline & Q. Correct. & & second thing that was attached is the SAS code \\
\hline 3 & A. It means, you know, how many times they & 3 & related to the analysis underlying the complaint. \\
\hline 4 & come ask me, "Andy, you will do again regression," & 4 & So my question is if you turn past the \\
\hline 5 & how many times they come back -- come back? & & e-mail to the pages Bates-numbered DOL 39877 to DOL \\
\hline 6 & Q. Correct. & 6 & 39880; do you recognize this as -- \\
\hline 7 & A. I cannot -- I cannot recall exact number. & 7 & A. Which page? \\
\hline 8 & Q. Was it more than one? & 8 & Q. The pages numbered DOL 39877 -- \\
\hline 9 & A. Yeah. More than one, yeah. & 9 & A. Okay. \\
\hline 10 & Q. And what do you recall about any times you & 10 & Q. -- to DOL 39880. \\
\hline 11 & were asked to run a different statistical model? & 11 & A. Uh-hm. \\
\hline 12 & What do you recall about those & 12 & Q. Is this SAS code related to an analysis \\
\hline 13 & conversations? & & that you conducted of Oracle's headquarters' \\
\hline 14 & MR. ELIASOPH: Again, objection with & 14 & location? \\
\hline 15 & respect to the extent this calls for invading the & 15 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it \\
\hline 16 & deliberative process privilege. & 16 & calls for speculation. \\
\hline 17 & MS. MANTOAN: Again, I don't think what & 17 & THE WITNESS: Usually -- oh, I run so many. \\
\hline 18 & he's told about how to run the model, to the extent & 18 & don't know if this one -- I run this one or not, \\
\hline 19 & the model ends up being part of anything that's & & you know. But looks like it's from our SAS -- from \\
\hline 20 & disclosed in the NOV or any of the complaints in the & 20 & our SAS program, yeah. \\
\hline 21 & case, is covered by that. & 21 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 22 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 22 & Q. From your -- from the SAS program? \\
\hline 23 & Q. Let's look at Attachment A -- & 23 & A. The SAS program, yeah. And my name is not \\
\hline 24 & A. Uh-hm. & 24 & there -- my name is not there either. Usually I \\
\hline 25 & Q. -- of Exhibit 2. & 25 & will put my name. If I run a regression, I put my \\
\hline & Page 86 & & Page 88 \\
\hline 1 & I'm going to ask you to read the first & 1 & name there. \\
\hline 2 & paragraph and then l'll have some questions for & 2 & Q. So when you -- when you run a regression do \\
\hline 3 & about you that first paragraph. & & you usually include your name in the SAS code \\
\hline 4 & A. This is 1404. & 4 & itself? \\
\hline 5 & Q. Correct. That starts "The United States & 5 & A. Yes. I put "Andy Leu," L-e-u, there, so... \\
\hline 6 & Department of Labor." & 6 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. \\
\hline 7 & A. Okay. & 7 & THE REPORTER: Exhibit 4. \\
\hline 8 & Q. Okay. Does the paragraph you just read on & 8 & THE WITNESS: Thank you. \\
\hline 9 & page 1404 describe a statistical model that you ran & 9 & (Exhibit 4 was marked for identification.) \\
\hline 10 & on data for Oracle's headquarters' location? & 10 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 11 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for & 11 & Q. So, for the record, Exhibit 4 is a document \\
\hline 12 & speculation. & 12 & with Bates-numbers DOL 5298 to DOL 5320. \\
\hline 13 & THE WITNESS: Yeah, I run many models with & 13 & And my first question is whether you -- it \\
\hline 14 & different factors. And this probably is -- maybe & 14 & has -- the document has a number of boxes that are \\
\hline 15 & one of them, maybe. I don't know, maybe somebody & 15 & redacting or obscuring information, but with that \\
\hline 16 & run for this. I cannot be sure because this doesn't & 16 & aside, do you recognize the document that's \\
\hline 17 & look like my report. & 17 & Exhibit 4? Does it look familiar to you? \\
\hline 18 & Thank you. & 18 & A. Yes. This looks like it's from our -- the \\
\hline 19 & THE REPORTER: Exhibit 3. & 19 & CS report, yes. \\
\hline 20 & (Exhibit 3 was marked for identification.) & 20 & Q. Which report? \\
\hline 21 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 21 & A. The compensation analysis report. \\
\hline 22 & Q. So we've marked as Exhibit 3 an & 22 & Q. Okay. Does this look to you, based on your \\
\hline 23 & October 26th, 2017, e-mail from Marc Pilotin at the & 23 & experience, like a report that came after a \\
\hline 24 & solicitor's office to Erin Connell of Orrick copying & 24 & regression was run in SAS? \\
\hline & a few other folks. & 25 & A. Uh-hm. But I cannot be sure I did this one \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

or not, or somebody did that, but it's a form of CS,
yeah.
Q. So I'm going to represent to you that we
served what is called a discovery request in this
case where we asked the other side for information.
And we asked OFCCP to identify each person who
participated in this compliance review of Oracle's
headquarters' location and that in response they
identified Shirong Andy Leu, statistician.
With that information, does that refresh
your recollection at all as to whether or not you
were the statistician who ran the analysis whose
results are reported in Exhibit 4?
A. Yeah, I can recognize that this is from CS
reports, but I cannot really recognize this is a
report from my analysis.
You know what I mean?
Q. Do you typically write an actual analysis
report after you run a regression model?
A. No, just CS -- this table (indicating),
this table (indicating). And then sometime they --
you know, sometime they want me to write one page of
the conclusion, but most the time they don't.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.

```
Q. So I'm going to represent to you that we served what is called a discovery request in this case where we asked the other side for information. And we asked OFCCP to identify each person who participated in this compliance review of Oracle's headquarters' location and that in response they identified Shirong Andy Leu, statistician.

With that information, does that refresh your recollection at all as to whether or not you were the statistician who ran the analysis whose results are reported in Exhibit 4?
A. Yeah, I can recognize that this is from CS reports, but I cannot really recognize this is a report from my analysis.

You know what I mean?
Q. Do you typically write an actual analysis report after you run a regression model?
A. No, just CS -- this table (indicating),
this table (indicating). And then sometime they -you know, sometime they want me to write one page of the conclusion, but most the time they don't.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. But do the results reported in Exhibit 4 take the form of the --

Do they look like how the results are reported out when you run regression analyses?
A. Yeah, look like -- yes, uh-hm.
Q. Okay. So a while back I asked if you
participated in the compliance review of Oracle's
headquarters' location --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- and you said yes.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. But now I've asked a couple questions about particular statistical analysis and you've told me that you're not sure if it was you.
A. Because sometime, you know, not only myself run this one. Maybe they are other people. Because many case sometime, for example, you a statistician, sometime you run, sometime I run, so I don't know.

You know, at that time, for example, we pull a case in Florida and we -- if any people have time, right, you can go there -- you can go there and, you know, pull down and then do the analysis. And sometimes, you know, we have some other people to do the second review, or whatever, and the result, whatever. So --
Q. Do you recall any other statisticians
working on the compliance review of Oracle's
headquarters' location?
A. I cannot make sure. I don't know.
Q. Okay. When you say "sometimes other statisticians" --
A. I just --
Q. -- "would look at the reports," who -- who,
in your experience, are some of those other
statisticians who at times will -- will look at an
analysis for an open compliance review that you are
also working on?
MR. ELIASOPH: So --
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
MR. ELIASOPH: Yeah --
THE WITNESS: I cannot recall.
MR. ELIASOPH: She's -- okay. He answered. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. What other statisticians do you work with at OFCCP?

MR. ELIASOPH: Okay. Objection to the extent you're requesting that he identify outside consultants or other experts.

MS. MANTOAN: Right.
/II

\section*{BY MS. MANTOAN:}
Q. I'm not asking for that. I'm asking what other statisticians employed by the department of labor do you work with?
A. I don't know. Only the management -maybe, you know, Janette knows. Janette can tell you, I don't know.
Q. You don't -- so you don't know the names of any other statisticians who work at the department of labor?

MS. MANTOAN: Objection. Misstates prior testimony.

THE WITNESS: Uh-hm, uh-hm. I don't know. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. Do you know who Bob LaJeunesse is?
A. Yeah. He is my current supervisor.
Q. Okay. Is he a statistician?
A. It's just I call him Mr. and a
statistician, yes.
Q. Okay. Does he work at the department of labor?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So other than Dr. LaJeunesse, can you think of any other statisticians who work at the -- for the department of labor?

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & Page 97 & Page 99 \\
\hline & (Short recess was taken from 12:15 p.m. & 1 A. It's a look like a company they have job \\
\hline 2 & until 12:16 p.m.) & 2 structures and usually the job function is -- \\
\hline 3 & THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the & 3 because job structure, so they have hierarchy. So a \\
\hline & record. The time is 12:16 p.m. & 4 job function may be in the top hierarchy. Below \\
\hline 5 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 5 that job function they have subfunctions, below the \\
\hline 6 & Q. So, I want to ask you some questions & 6 subfunction usually they have a microfamily -- \\
\hline 7 & looking back at Exhibit 2. & 7 microjob family and below that they have job family, \\
\hline 8 & A. One, four, three -- two, okay. & 8 then after that maybe have career track, so on and \\
\hline 9 & Q. Looking at Attachment A. That's what & 9 so forth, you know. And they have definition, but \\
\hline 10 & starts at page 1404. & 10 I'm sorry, I cannot remember all the definition at \\
\hline 11 & A. 1404, okay. & 11 all. \\
\hline 12 & Q. Okay. Starting in the middle of that first & 12 Q. And is what you just testified to your \\
\hline 13 & paragraph it says, "OFCCP analyzed Oracle employees' & 13 understanding, generally, of what job functions are \\
\hline 14 & compensation data by Oracle job function." & 14 at companies or is that your understanding of what a \\
\hline 15 & Do you see where I read that? & 15 job function is at Oracle in particular? \\
\hline 16 & A. Yeah. & 16 A. I don't know about Oracle in particular, \\
\hline 17 & Q. Did you conduct an analysis of Oracle's & 17 that's true. \\
\hline 18 & headquarters' location by job function? & 18 Q. Okay. \\
\hline 19 & A. I believe so, yeah. & 19 A. But this is -- I just tell you, is kind of \\
\hline 20 & Q. Okay. What is a job function at Oracle? & 20 general IT, you know. \\
\hline 21 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for & 21 Q. Okay. \\
\hline 22 & speculation. & 22 A. Not -- I don't know, maybe Oracle have \\
\hline 23 & THE WITNESS: I just followed Janette, you & 23 special structure -- job structure. I don't know. \\
\hline 24 & know, who used this PAG. & 24 Q. Okay. \\
\hline 25 & /// & 25 A. I never see that. \\
\hline & BY MS. MANTOAN: Page 98 & 1 Q. Okay. So I have a few questions here and I \\
\hline 2 & Q. Okay. So separate question, though, is if & 2 am going to ask about your understanding of these \\
\hline 3 & you have an understanding of what job function is at & 3 terms with respect to Oracle in particular, and if \\
\hline 4 & Oracle. & 4 you don't have an understanding with respect to \\
\hline 5 & A. It's kind of the -- to my knowledge, it's & 5 Oracle in particular that's fine; you can say so. \\
\hline 6 & kind of -- I don't know if it's correct or not. & 6 Before I do that, you mentioned earlier \\
\hline 7 & Really I don't want to answer. You know what, I'm & 7 that in connection with the Oracle headquarters' \\
\hline 8 & not hundred percent sure, you know, -- & 8 compliance review you received a data file, correct? \\
\hline 9 & Q. Okay. & 9 A. Uh-hm. \\
\hline 10 & A. -- so... & 10 Q. To your recollection, did you receive just \\
\hline 11 & Q. So, as you sit here today, you don't have & 11 a single data file or did you receive more than one? \\
\hline 12 & an understanding that you can share of what job & 12 A. Okay. When you see -- just clarify your \\
\hline 13 & function is at Oracle? & 13 questions. \\
\hline 14 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for & 14 When you see multi-profile what do you \\
\hline 15 & speculation. Asked and answered. & 15 mean? Like a different period -- different period \\
\hline 16 & MS. MANTOAN: I'm just asking his & 16 of time? \\
\hline 17 & understanding. & 17 Q. I mean did you get a -- \\
\hline 18 & THE WITNESS: I cannot remember. I know & 18 A. Time period different, you know. \\
\hline 19 & it, but I just cannot remember. & 19 Q. Did the data that you recall receiving come \\
\hline 20 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 20 in an Excel file? \\
\hline 21 & Q. Do you have a rough idea? I appreciate & 21 A. It's Excel file, that's right. \\
\hline 22 & that it's been some time and so you may not have & 22 Q. Okay. So did you get one or more than one \\
\hline 23 & every precise detail memorized, but as you sit here & 23 Excel files in connection with your work on Oracle's \\
\hline & today, do you have even any rough understanding of & 24 headquarters' compliance review? \\
\hline & what a job function is at Oracle? & 25 A. I cannot recall, but I know there is at \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

least one.
Q. Right. And you don't remember if you got any others; is that correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. What, if any --
A. Maybe I have. I don't know.
Q. What, if any, other documents or data did
you receive to review in connection with Oracle's
headquarters' compliance review?
A. I think the data already in Excels. I heard probably they pull from --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I heard...
THE WITNESS: I heard the data -- I heard
data may be from different legacy system put into the Excels, but I don't know that part. I don't know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. So you got one or more Excel files, correct -- at least one, maybe more?
A. Yeah, maybe one, or two, or three -- I
don't know, at least one.
Q. Did you get any documents that weren't

Excel files to review in connection with the Oracle headquarters' compliance review?
A. What kind of --
the question, just don't state the content of the
communications.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. ELIASOPH: But you can discuss the
communications that you received.


Y MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Did you receive any other information,
other than that data file -- one or more data files,
to review in connection with this compliance review
of Oracle's headquarters' location?
A. I cannot recall how many. I don't know.
Q. But you -- do you recall receiving anything
ther than a data file?
A. No. Just data file and the model from

Janette, that's it.
Q. Did you receive -- the answer to these next
series of questions maybe somewhat contained in what
you just said, but l'm going to ask just so the record is clear.

Did you receive any policy documents to

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.

BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Did you receive any Oracle policies to review?
A. No.
Q. Did you receive any interview notes or memos to review?
A. No.
Q. Did you receive any e-mail communications from Oracle?
A. I cannot recall.
Q. Did you --
A. I mean probably -- I believe "probably"
means no, but I cannot recall.
Q. Okay.
A. Because I -- my job, right, usually they
don't send me the documents from the contractor, so I assume no.
Q. Did you receive any explanations --
separate from whether they were policies, any
explanations that you understood to have been
written by Oracle about how pay works at Oracle?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Did you receive any data
dictionaries that would define or explain the data fields that were in the data files that you
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reviewed?
A. No.
Q. Turning back to Attachment A in Exhibit 2.

That sentence that started "OFCCP analyzed" --
Oh, I'm sorry, I'm on page 1404 again.
That will be the page I'm on for the majority --
A. Okay.
Q. -- of this set of questions.

There's the sentence that starts with:
'OFCCP analyzed Oracle employees'
compensation data by Oracle job function,"
continues, "using a model that included the natural log of" --
THE REPORTER: I need you to slow down.
MS. MANTOAN: It continues:
-- "using a model that included the natural
log of annual salary as a dependent
variable."
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Why would you conduct a model using the natural log of annual salary as opposed to just the dollar value of annual salary?
A. Oh, for the economy reason. Because this nature log, they will produce the percentage -- how many percent of female was paid along with the male,
```
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    they produced the percentage.
It's easy to -- it's easy to understand,
you know, that way. That's why we used the log.
And --
Q. And why did you analyze -- does annual
salary here mean base salary?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you analyze base salary as opposed
to total compensation or some other measure of
compensation?
A. Here it's annual salary, right?
Q. That says "annual salary" in the exhibit.
A. Yeah. So what's your question?
Q. Why did you analyze annual salary as
opposed to total compensation?
A. As -- as opposed to total compensation?
Q. Yeah.
A. Okay. Let me regress your questions.
It means what's the difference between the
base pay or a total compensation when you do the
regression for both of them?
Q. I'm asking why did you do a regression for
annual salary instead of for total compensation?
A. Oh. Usually we -- every time we start with
the base salary.
Q. Why?
A. I don't know. You can start -- you can
start total, too, but like I say, we don't know --
we cannot find factor to evaluate the total comp,
basically.
Q. Did you do a total compensation analysis of
Oracle's headquarters' location?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Deliberative
process.
THE WITNESS: I cannot -- I cannot
remember.
MS. MANTOAN: Are you instructing him not
to answer?
MR. ELIASOPH: I am.
THE WITNESS: I cannot recall.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. I'm going to continue reading this
sentence, and I have a few questions about --
A. Yes, please.
Q. -- this.
The sentence after "dependent variable"
continues.
-- "and accounted for differences in
employees' gender, work experience at
Oracle, work experience prior to Oracle,
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Q. Why?
A. I don't know. You can start -- you can
start total, too, but like I say, we don't know --
we cannot find factor to evaluate the total comp, basically.
Q. Did you do a total compensation analysis of

Oracle's headquarters' location?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Deliberative process.

THE WITNESS: I cannot -- I cannot remember.

MS. MANTOAN: Are you instructing him not to answer?

MR. ELIASOPH: I am.
THE WITNESS: I cannot recall.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. I'm going to continue reading this sentence, and I have a few questions about --
A. Yes, please.
Q. -- this.

The sentence after "dependent variable" continues.
-- "and accounted for differences in employees' gender, work experience at Oracle, work experience prior to Oracle,
full-time/part-time status, exempt status, global career level, job specialty, and job title."
Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So how did your model control for
work experience at Oracle?
What was used to represent or capture work experience at Oracle?
A. You mean the work experience prior to Oracle?
Q. No, work experience at Oracle.
A. Okay. From the date they hire -- they were hired to the snapshot you -- I mean contractor sent to us, the snapshot. So this one will be time in the company.
Q. Did you account for leaves of absence in your measure of work experience at Oracle?
A. No.
Q. Okay. When you say "date of hire," do you mean date of hire at Oracle America, Inc., or do you mean date of hire at, let's say, a predecessor company that Oracle might have acquired with the employee then continuously working at Oracle?
A. I cannot recall.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. You don't recall how you selected that hire date to measure from hire to snapshot, correct?
A. Yeah, I just -- they provide us a hire date there, right, but they don't explain a little bit more explanation, so they say, "Andy, can you do the regression for us" like that.
Q. Do you have a view, as a statistician, as to whether you would ideally use the hire date only
to whether you would ideally use the hire date only
at Oracle America or whether you would use the hire date at a predecessor company or a sister company?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation. Calls for legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I cannot recall that specific situation, no.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So I'm just asking if you have a view as to which is statistically more proper.
A. Yeah, yeah, well, I will review, yes, so sometimes I review, so...
Q. But did you -- it's not "did you review";
it's "do you have a view."
Do you have an opinion as to whether the
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it

Y MS. MANTOAN:

```
hire date that's used in a work experience
calculation should be hire date only at the legal
entity you're looking at or a continuous service
date which might bring in time at a prior company?
    A. Yeah.
    MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for legal
conclusion. Calls for speculation.
    THE WITNESS: I think at that time I just,
you know, follow Janette's, you know, instruction.
Do the -- they already come -- they already come,
the time in company, for us -- for me already. They
come for me. They send me that data, you know.
    MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
    THE WITNESS: They don't give a -- for
example -- they give me the --
    I'm sorry, go ahead.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
    Q. Yeah, I'm -- I'm not asking sort of a
historical question about how this came to be in
this analysis. I'm asking you, as someone with a
Ph.D. in applied statistics, whether you have a view
as to whether when you're looking at work experience
at a company that may have, say, acquired other
companies if you should look only at the hire date
at that company or if you should look at the
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continuous service date.
    A. Yeah, usually I --
    Q. I'm asking your opinion.
    A. I'm sorry.
        MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it
calls for a legal conclusion and speculation.
        THE WITNESS: So what do you want me
answer?
BY MS. MANTOAN:
    Q. I'm asking your opinion, as --
    A. Okay. Okay.
    Q. -- someone with a Ph.D. in applied
statistics, --
    A. Uh-hm.
    Q. -- whether you have a view as to how work
experience should be computed when a company has,
say, acquired a company and assumed their employees?
    A. Yes, I will --
        MR. ELIASOPH: Same -- same objections.
        THE WITNESS: Yeah, I will review based on
the information they give to me. If I don't have
information, I cannot do that.
    MS. MANTOAN: Right.
    THE WITNESS: Yeah.
///
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So, I'm not asking about the information you were given. I'm asking about your opinion about how a statistical analysis should be done.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. How should the work experience variable be constructed --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- based on your knowledge of -- and Ph.D.
in, applied statistics?
So if you're -- so, let me -- with that background, let me ask the question.

In constructing a work experience variable in a compensation analysis, for a company that has acquired other companies, do you think the hire date you should use is the hire date only at the present company or should it extend back to the hire date at the predecessor company?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Confusing.
Calls for legal conclusion. Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: You know, my -- my opinion is of course you have to consider, you know --

MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
THE WITNESS: -- you have to reflect, you know, the work and the years of experience.
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BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. In constructing a work experience
variable in a compensation analysis, do you think
that leaves of absence should be reduced or backed
out of the work experience calculation?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for
speculation. Calls for a legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I don't have an opinion for this.

MS. MANTOAN: Okay. Just a few more questions right here and then maybe we'll have a good time to stop for the lunch break.

MR. ELIASOPH: Okay.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Are you okay to keep going right now, Dr. Leu?
A. Yes, please.
Q. Okay. After work experience at Oracle, the next -- the next factor listed here in Attachment A is "Work Experience Prior to Oracle."

How was that work experience prior to Oracle variable constructed or reflected in the model that you did?
A. Okay. Usually we use the -- their birthday as a proxy.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & So, in the first step I use the hire date Page 113 & & A. Okay. Then after that you subtract the Page 115 \\
\hline & and the snapshot, I already find time in company, & & 18 years old. That would be prior experience. \\
\hline 3 & right? Time in company are here. So then after & 3 & Q. So, I'm sorry, I feel like we just \\
\hline & that I find birthday, right? So this prior proxy is & 4 & described two different ways. I had described a \\
\hline 5 & -- from a -- from a -- from the birthday and from & 5 & way, you said "Yes, that's how it's done," and then \\
\hline & e 18 years old, okay? And before he started his & 6 & you described a different way. \\
\hline 7 & b, you know, is they have a very after -- but & 7 & A. Okay. \\
\hline & basically we operate like this. We calculate the & 8 & Q. So can you explain again? \\
\hline & rior experience by after 18 years old and before & 9 & A. Okay. \\
\hline 10 & the first job. before that -- no, I'm sorry, before & 10 & MR. ELIASOPH: So just so we have a clear \\
\hline & ey start to count in Oracle. If we don't -- you & 11 & record, maybe if you can ask him what -- what \\
\hline & now, if we don't find any actual prior experience, & 12 & pecifically do you want him to explain. \\
\hline 13 & e can this way. & 13 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 14 & Q. What was the last thing you said? & 14 & Q. I would like you to explain how you \\
\hline 15 & A. If we don't find any, like, actual, & 15 & calculated work experience prior to Oracle in the \\
\hline 16 & actual -- actual experience, prior experience, so we & 16 & odel reflected in Attachment A. \\
\hline 17 & use the time -- time in company, right? & 17 & A. Can I have a pen? \\
\hline 18 & Q. Uh-hm. & 18 & MR. ELIASOPH: Okay. \\
\hline 19 & A. Time in company, thinking about here, & 19 & MS. MANTOAN: Well, the record won't be \\
\hline & right? & & le to tell what you're writing down. \\
\hline 21 & Q. Uh-hm. & 21 & MR. ELIASOPH: Yeah. \\
\hline 22 & A. And 18 years old here, right, when you're & 22 & MS. MANTOAN: -- but -- \\
\hline 23 & 18 years old. & 23 & MR. ELIASOPH: Do you -- \\
\hline 24 & Q. Uh-hm, yes. & 24 & THE WITNESS: But I try -- this way -- \\
\hline 25 & A. And you're in Oracle right here & 25 & MS. MANTOAN: To give an example? \\
\hline & (indicating). Page 114 & 1 & THE WITNESS: No, no. I can -- sometime I 116 \\
\hline 2 & MR. ELIASOPH: Okay. Just remember the & 2 & put in here. I can speak well -- \\
\hline & anscript won't pick up your hand gestures. & 3 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. \\
\hline 4 & THE WITNESS: Okay. & 4 & THE WITNESS: Speak it -- speak it well. \\
\hline 5 & MR. ELIASOPH: So to the extent you can say & 5 & Okay. \\
\hline & and not show it -- we do have the videographer & 6 & MR. ELIASOPH: Okay. I object to the \\
\hline & ere, but that's harder to get in front of the & & tent this calls for speculation. \\
\hline 8 & ourt. & 8 & You've previously stated that you don't \\
\hline & BY MS. MANTOAN: & & member a lot of specific details, but if you do \\
\hline 10 & Q. So is it -- the way you constructed this & & member please go ahead and answer the question. \\
\hline & variable, am I correct, is hire date at Oracle & 11 & THE WITNESS: Yeah, this is a statistical \\
\hline 12 & America minus their birth date, -- & & art I remember -- \\
\hline 13 & A. Let me -- let me speak this way -- & 13 & MR. ELIASOPH: Okay. \\
\hline 14 & Q. -- so how old they were when they worked at & 14 & THE WITNESS: -- very well. This is my \\
\hline & Oracle America minus 18 years? & & personal -- you know, so I do this part. \\
\hline 16 & A. Uh-hm. & 16 & MS. MANTOAN: Great. \\
\hline & Q. Is that correct? & 17 & THE WITNESS: Okay. We calculate this way, \\
\hline 18 & A. Yeah. & & e use a -- the snapshot, the years between snapshot \\
\hline & Q. That's ho & & and the birthday, okay, and then subtract the time \\
\hline 20 & A. That's the period, yeah. & & company, means the time in Oracle company, and \\
\hline 21 & Also you can say, like, you know, you use & & hen subtract the 18. That will be my years of \\
\hline & e snapshot, subtract the birthday, because we & & xperience prior -- for prior. \\
\hline & ready have a time in company snapshot, subtract & 23 & MS. MANTOAN: Thank you. \\
\hline & the hiring date. & & THE WITNESS: Okay. \\
\hline 25 & Q. Uh-hm. & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So I believe this is the same thing, but
tell me -- tell me if l'm right.
A. Yeah.
Q. The age of a given employee as of the date of the snapshot?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. You then subtract the years that they've
been at Oracle, so the time between the snapshot
date and the hire date?
A. Yeah.
Q. And then you know how old they were when they were hired at Oracle --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- according to that hire date?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And then you subtract 18 --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- from that? And then what remains is --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- the work experience prior to Oracle?
A. Yeah. Because before 18 we can assume it was in college time. They don't have work yet, so...
Q. Okay. Is that a standard way that you
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compute work experience or was that something
different that you did in this Oracle headquarters'
compliance review?
A. No. This is basically a lot of article --
economic article, right? They did a lot of
compensation and they used it prior. They used this way, you know.
Q. Okay. And this work experience prior to Oracle is a proxy variable, correct?
A. It's a proxy, yes.
Q. That's because you didn't know the actual
work experience that any given employee that was
included in this model had prior to Oracle, correct?
A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm. Before -- before the
Oracle, right, we don't have the actual years of experience.
Q. Okay. So you don't, in fact, know for any
employee who was is included in this model how many
years of actual work experience they had prior to
Oracle, correct?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and
answered.
THE WITNESS: I don't know this part, you
know.
///

BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Sorry, I'm not clear if --

Do you know for any employee who was
included in this model in Attachment A how many
actual years of work experience they had prior to
Oracle?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and
answered.
THE WITNESS: No, I don't know. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. Do you know the type of work experience, prior to Oracle, that any of the employees, who you included in the model in Attachment A, had prior to Oracle?
A. You mean they have prior experience?
Q. So your work experience prior to Oracle variable is just a count of years, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is there anything in the model, whose results are reflected in Attachment A, that accounts for the type of prior experience as opposed to just a numeric count of -- of years?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah, not here, no.
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Q. So if you had two employees at Oracle who
as of the date of the snapshot were 40 years old,
had each been at Oracle for five years, you're going
to assign the same value for work experience prior to Oracle to both of them, correct?
A. Usually I don't -- I -- it's not my job to do that, no.
Q. That's what the -- the calculation would give them the same value for work experience prior to Oracle, correct?
A. Prior to the Oracle?
Q. If two employees -- let me start again.

If two employees, as of the snapshot date
that you're looking at, were the same age --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- and had been at Oracle for the same amount of time --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- the model would give them an identical value for work experience prior to Oracle?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that would be true even if one of them had never worked prior to Oracle and one of them had worked consistently in tech prior to Oracle, correct?

 s, for the pay.
Q. Do those reports typically include
information about whether each of the separate factors that you've included in the model is itself
tatistically significant?
Q. Do those reports typically include
information about whether each of the separate
factors that you've included in the model is itself
statistically significant?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent that
this is a confusing question.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So if you have a tenure variable in a model
does the report you generate typically indicate
whether that tenure variable is a statistically
significant predictor of pay?
THE REPORTER: I need you --
Does the report you generate typically...
Q. -- typically indicate whether tenure is a statistically significant predictor of pay?
A. Yes, they provide a significance, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. They do.
Q. And for each of the factors that you
typically indicates whether that factor is a
statistically significant predictor of pay, correct?
Q. Okay. Did you personally review any
information to determine whether or not these -- the
factors listed in Attachment A were valid factors to
A. Not for Oracle, no.
Q. Have you done that in other compliance

MR. ELIASOPH: Don't --
THE WITNESS: Not that I can recall.
MR. ELIASOPH: Okay.
And just -- we want to keep confidential

THE WITNESS: Uh-hm.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. What did you do, if anything, to confirm
that the employees being compared through the model,
whose results are reflected in Attachment A, were

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and

\section*{answered. Compound. Calls for speculation. \\ THE WITNESS: I cannot recall for this \\ part. \\ BY MS. MANTOAN:}
Q. Did you -- do you recall doing anything to
confirm whether the employees that the model
compares are performing substantially similar work?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and
answered.
THE WITNESS: What do you mean? You mean
compare the similar work? I don't know. I
cannot -- I cannot answer this question, so --
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. We talked earlier --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- about needing to group together
comparable employees.
A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm.
Q. What did you do, if anything, to determine
whether the model, whose results are presented in
Attachment A, groups together comparable employees?
A. No, I don't do that part, no.
Q. So you don't have any opinion, one way or another, as to whether the model, whose results are presented in Attachment A, groups together employees
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who are comparable; is that correct?
A. Yeah. Janette, she decide, I believe, yeah.

MS. MANTOAN: I am ready to take a lunch break, if you are.

MR. ELIASOPH: Yeah -- yes, let's do that.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record.

The time is \(12: 50 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}\).
(Lunch break was taken from 12:50 p.m.
until 1:32 p.m.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record.

The time is \(1: 32\) p.m.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Leu?
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I understand -- well, let me ask this...

Did you have an opportunity to speak with counsel during the break?
A. To what?
Q. Did you speak with your lawyer during the break?
A. Me?
Q. Yes.
A. I met him?
Q. Did you speak with him during the break?
A. Oh, yeah, yeah.
Q. Okay. So having taken a break and having spoken with your lawyer what would you like to clarify? I understand there's something you wanted to clarify.
A. Oh. In the beginning you asked me a
question about "Did you talk to anybody before I
come here."
Q. Uh-hm.
A. I said "No."
Q. Uh-hm.
A. But I was thinking to my group, you know, I
said, but I talked with him.
Q. Oh.
A. And usually, you know, he talked to me -(To Mr. Eliasoph) Since last Friday, right? MR. ELIASOPH: Oh, yeah.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. Okay. So you did meet with

Mr. Eliasoph --
A. Yeah, yeah, yeah. I --
Q. -- before the deposition?
A. I say - "no" means my group, no, I don't
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anytime --
Q. Okay.
A. -- talk to them.
Q. Was there anyone else present in your
meeting with Mr. Eliasoph?
A. Any what?
Q. Was anyone else present when you met with

Mr. Eliasoph?
A. No. Yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. oh, yeah, yeah. One people, one people.
Q. Okay. Who is that?
A. He's call him Andrew.
Q. Okay. Another attorney?
A. Yeah, yeah, Andrew, yes.
Q. Did you meet last Friday, you said?
A. Last Friday, yes.
Q. Okay. And for how long did you meet?
A. Probably one hour.
Q. Okay.
A. One hour, one hour, five minutes, 10
minutes, something like that.
Q. Okay. And in that meeting did you review
any documents that refreshed your memory about the compliance review we've been talking about?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Anything else that you want to clarify or expand on from this morning?
A. I don't -- I don't think, yeah, except the
one. I don't think -- no, I don't think, yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. So let's go back to Exhibit 2, if we can.
A. Okay.
Q. And turn to Attachment A in that, which starts at 1404.
A. Two and 14-4 (sic).
Q. Yes, please.
A. Okay.
Q. So we spent a lot of time before the break --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- talking about the model whose results are reflected here.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. And we talked about the factors --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- that were included in that model, correct?
A. Uh-hm.
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Q. So if you flip over to the next page, 1405.
A. Uh-hm. Okay.
Q. Well, let's back up a second.

The results on 1404 are the results of a
regression analysis looking at differences between men and women, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And then if you flip to 1405 it
presents the results of a regression analysis first
looking at differences between African-Americans and
White employees, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And second looking at differences between

\section*{Asian and White employees, correct?}
A. Asian, yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. So I believe that the model that was used
to generate the results that appear on page 1405 is the same model that was used to generate the results
on 1404 based on the description of what was
included and I just wanted to confirm whether that's correct.

Was the same model used to generate the results on 1405 as was used to generate the results

\section*{on 1404?}

MR. ELIASOPH: And objection to the extent it calls for speculation.

The witness has testified he has never seen these documents before.

THE WITNESS: I cannot make sure, but looks
like -- based on the factors right here, looks like from the same model.

Like I say, you know, because maybe they copy something to here (indicating), not original show my report right here (indicating).

MS. MANTOAN: Uh-hm.
THE WITNESS: So maybe they cut -- I did not -- you say, how many regression I did; I did maybe less than five -- 100, right -- like, you know, we talk about, maybe 10, less 100, and I think probably the -- I assume they're the same -- same models.

MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
THE WITNESS: You know, because my -- I have my own CS report, right, and usually they just take the CS report, the standardation (sic), right?
And put it right here (indicating), and then the female or the male counts on there. That's it.

MS. MANTOAN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Do you believe that Attachment A presents
the results of a statistical analysis that you did of Oracle's headquarters' location?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: I -- I cannot be sure because my run also have -- for example, right on here (indicating) I have standard deviation negative 2.1 and negative 3.55 , and this is for maybe another company. They pull -- pull out from another report. I don't know. So you have show my original report, you know, and I can -- "Oh, okay, this is from me."

You know what I mean?
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Well, do you believe Exhibit 4 are your original results?
A. Which one? Let me see.

This one (indicating)?
Q. Correct.
A. Well, every -- every report come out look
like this, not just in Oracle.
You know what I mean?
Q. Okay.
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ght. to --
A. Yeah.
Q. But when we were talking this morning about
how different variables were constructed --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- you were testifying as to how you
constructed variables in the analysis you did of
Oracle's headquarters' location, correct?
A. Yeah, I think so, Oracle location, yes,
Q. Okay. And when you were conducting your
statistical analysis of Oracle headquarters'
location did you use the same model structure to
evaluate compensation differences between men and
women as you used to evaluate compensation
differences between White employees and other races?
A. Yeah, usually should be that way, yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. Same models for gender and the race, yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. And, of course, like we -- I'm just kind of worried that if I did many, many models -- you know,
Model A, Model B, and they put Model A for the gender, the extract from Model A, right?
Q. Uh-hm.
A. And it erase from whatever.

Basically, I just in the beginning I told you I don't read this kind of report. You know, first time I read this report.
Q. You've never seen this Exhibit 2 --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- this Notice of Violation?
A. No, no, yeah.
Q. Okay. Did the statistical model that you
used to evaluate Oracle's headquarters' location
include any control for differences in education?
A. I have to -- I don't know. I can't recall.

I cannot recall. I'm sorry.
MS. MANTOAN: Okay. Counsel, to make these questions easier, are you willing to stipulate that the results in Attachment A are the results of a model that Dr. Leu ran?

MR. ELIASOPH: Yes.
MS. MANTOAN: Okay. And are you willing

MR. ELIASOPH: That's my -- that's my understanding.

MS. MANTOAN: And are you willing to stipulate that Exhibit 4 presents the results of the model that Dr. Leu ran?

MR. ELIASOPH: I'll just say that's my
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Page 137 & & Page 139 \\
\hline & understanding. & & some analysts, but I don't know specifically for \\
\hline 2 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. So in addition to & & Oracle, if I sent to Jane as well -- Jane Suhr, \\
\hline 3 & potentially keeping the deposition open for certain & & S-u-h-r is the last name. \\
\hline & privileged objections pending the resolution that & & Q. Jane Suhr? \\
\hline & would be another reason to keep the deposition open & 5 & A. Yeah. Jane Suhr, yes. \\
\hline & at the end if that understanding proves to be & 6 & Q. Okay. \\
\hline 7 & incorrect. & 7 & A. Other than that, I never -- I don't send to \\
\hline 8 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & & any other people at all. \\
\hline 9 & Q. So, Dr. Leu, operating on the assumption & 9 & Q. Okay. And is that typical in a compliance \\
\hline 10 & and the stipulation that the results presented in & & view that you send your statistical analysis to -- \\
\hline 11 & Attachment A to Exhibit 2 are results of a model & & hat you would send it to Ms. Wipper when she was at \\
\hline 12 & that you ran, did that -- did the model that you ran & & OFCCP? \\
\hline 13 & contain any control for differences in education? & & A. Yeah. \\
\hline 14 & A. I cannot recall. I'm serious, I cannot & & Q. Okay. \\
\hline 15 & recall. & 15 & A. Because she give me the order, so I just \\
\hline 16 & Q. Do you see anything in the description of & & send to her. That's it. \\
\hline 17 & the model set forth in Attachment A that indicates a & 17 & Q. And the order she gave you included which \\
\hline 18 & control for education? & & factors to include in the model, correct? \\
\hline 19 & A. Right here we don't have -- in this paper I & & A. Yeah. \\
\hline & don't see any education right here. Okay. & & Q. And the order she gave you included which \\
\hline 21 & Like I say, you know, usually I recognize, & & employee groupings to use? \\
\hline & you know -- the analysis I was doing, it should have & & A. Yes. They included -- yeah, the -- yeah, \\
\hline & my name in there, but I don't know, this -- it don't & & at's righ \\
\hline & have my name in here. & & Q. Okay. Do you have any understanding of \\
\hline 25 & Q. Let's look at Exhibit 3 -- & & whether Oracle -- \\
\hline & A Page 138 & & Page 140 \\
\hline & A. Yeah. & 1 & MR. ELIASOPH: I just want to state for the \\
\hline 2 & Q. -- please. & & cord that I allowed those questions in light of \\
\hline 3 & A. Exhibit 3, all right. Okay. & & the judge's order, -- \\
\hline 4 & Q. And if you could flip to the second page of & 4 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. \\
\hline 5 & Exhibit 3, the one that starts with 39877. & 5 & MR. ELIASOPH: - not that I believe that \\
\hline 6 & A. Okay. Yeah. & & it's directly on point, but I do think that should \\
\hline 7 & Q. We talked about this earlier as a SAS code, & & ke care -- because he asked of any concern you \\
\hline 8 & correct? & & think would linger that that was the specific line \\
\hline 9 & A. Yes. & 9 & of questioning the judge authorized, and I don't \\
\hline 10 & Q. Okay. Do you see anything in this SAS code & 10 & believe it goes anything further. \\
\hline 11 & that indicates that the statistical model it was & 1 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. That is noted. \\
\hline 12 & generating included any control for education? & 12 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 13 & A. Okay. No, they don't have educations. & 13 & Q. Do you have any understanding, one way or \\
\hline 14 & Q. Okay. When you completed the statistical & & he other, of whether Oracle ever said that \\
\hline 15 & analysis -- & & employees should be grouped in the way that your \\
\hline 16 & A. Uh-hm. & 16 & statistical model groups them? \\
\hline 17 & Q. -- that you did of Oracle headquarters' & 17 & A. You mean the -- hear from Oracle? \\
\hline 18 & location -- & 18 & Q. Right. Did you ever -- did you ever see or \\
\hline 19 & A. Uh-hm. & 9 & hear any information that indicated that Oracle had \\
\hline 20 & Q. -- who, if anyone, did you send it to? & & said that those were the groupings that should be \\
\hline 21 & A. I just directly send to Janette. & 21 & used to evaluate pay -- \\
\hline 22 & Q. You said you just sent it to Janette? & 22 & A. No. \\
\hline 23 & A. Yeah. & 23 & Q. -- amongst its employees? \\
\hline 24 & Q. Did you copy anyone on that e-mail? & 24 & A. No. \\
\hline 25 & A. But I cannot recall, but sometime there's & 25 & MR. ELIASOPH: Okay. And let her finish \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry.
Y MS. MANTOAN:
Q. And did you ever see or hear any
nformation that indicated that Oracle had said that
the factors that you included in your model were the
factors that should be used to evaluate pay amongst

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Compound. Calls
for speculation.
THE WITNESS: No.
Q. What, if anything, did you do to determine
whether the factors that are controlled for in your
statistical model were in fact factors considered by
Oracle when it was determining pay?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Confusing.
Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: "Did you do to determine"...
No.
Q. "No" meaning you did not do anything?
A. Na-huh. I didn't hear, yeah, from
Q. No, the question is whether you did
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statistical model, set forth in Attachment A, Exhibit 2 --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- were legitimate factors at Oracle?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for legal
conclusion. Vague.
THE WITNESS: No, I just followed Janette
orders at the time. I don't think a little bit
further about, you know -- 'cause I was -- I heard
the data is pretty clean at that time. I don't
know...
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So the model set forth --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- in Attachment A to Exhibit 2 includes a control for job title, correct?
A. Which page?
Q. Well, you said the model on 1404 and 1405 are the same.
A. Oh, 1404, yeah.
Q. The question is whether the model set forth in Attachment A to Exhibit 2, specifically pages 1404 and 1405 --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- includes a control for job title.

Page 144
A. I assume so, yeah. Because job title's right here.
Q. Okay. How -- I'm going to ask you a series
of questions and if the answer to the questions is
"I don't know," that's fine.
A. Okay.
Q. I just want to get your best knowledge.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. How is "job title" used at Oracle?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Did you ever review any job descriptions from Oracle?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever review any job postings from Oracle?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any understanding of how the
work that a software developer at Oracle does might
differ from the work that an application developer at Oracle does?
A. I do in some extent, but not from the Oracle. From -- like O*NET OnLine they talk about occupational job and how much they're expected to pay. I got -- I find out their different pay, so supposed to be different, but I never heard from
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Page 145 & & Page 147 \\
\hline & Oracle at all. & 1 & MS. MANTOAN: I'm just asking what you \\
\hline 2 & Q. So the understanding you just testified to & & know. \\
\hline 3 & is from \(\mathbf{O}^{* N E T, ~ w h i c h ~ i s ~ g e n e r a l ~ l a b o r ~ m a r k e t ~ i n f o ? ~}\) & 3 & THE WITNESS: I don't know. \\
\hline 4 & A. Yeah, yeah. & 4 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 5 & Q. Okay. How many different products do & 5 & Q. Does work on the different products that \\
\hline 6 & employees at Oracle's headquarters' location work & 6 & Oracle makes require the same effort? \\
\hline 7 & on? & 7 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for \\
\hline 8 & A. Headquarter? & 8 & speculation. Calls for legal conclusion. \\
\hline 9 & Q. Their -- the location that was the subject & 9 & THE WITNESS: It's -- it's vague. I don't \\
\hline 10 & of this compliance review we've referred to today as & 10 & know. \\
\hline 11 & Oracle's headquarters. & 11 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 12 & A. Uh-hm. & 12 & Q. Okay. Do the different products that \\
\hline 13 & Q. My question is: How many different & 13 & Oracle makes differ in their importance to the \\
\hline 14 & products do employees, work (sic) at that & 14 & company; -- \\
\hline 15 & headquarters' location, work on? & 15 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for \\
\hline 16 & A. I don't know this one, no. & 16 & speculation. \\
\hline 17 & Q. Okay. Your answer is "I don't know"? & 17 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 18 & A. I don't know. & 18 & Q. -- if you know. \\
\hline 19 & Q. Okay. Do you know how the products that & 19 & A. I don't know. \\
\hline 20 & Oracle employees work on differ from one another, or & 20 & Q. Okay. Another question about the \\
\hline 21 & are similar to one another? & 21 & statistical analysis whose results are presented in \\
\hline 22 & A. I assume so. & 22 & Attachment A in Exhibit 2... \\
\hline 23 & Q. You assume which? & 23 & Does Attachment A contain any analysis of \\
\hline 24 & A. Because, to my knowledge, in Oracle many -- & 24 & whether any particular practice at Oracle caused the \\
\hline 25 & many kind of the products, right, so there's & 25 & salary differences that were observed? \\
\hline & Page 146 & & Page 148 \\
\hline 1 & supposed to people, you know -- no -- & 1 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague. Calls \\
\hline 2 & THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. So there's... & & for legal conclusion. \\
\hline 3 & THE WITNESS: Because Oracle, they make a & 3 & THE WITNESS: Which page? \\
\hline 4 & lot of product, so some people may do this and some & 4 & MS. MANTOAN: Let's start at 1404. \\
\hline 5 & people do another product. Right? & 5 & THE WITNESS: 1404. \\
\hline 6 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. & 6 & And your question -- I forget your \\
\hline 7 & THE REPORTER: I don't -- & 7 & question. \\
\hline 8 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 8 & MS. MANTOAN: I'll ask it again. \\
\hline 9 & Q. Some people make one product and some & 9 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 10 & people make another product? & 10 & Q. Does Attachment A at page 1404 contain any \\
\hline 11 & A. Yeah. & 11 & analysis of whether any particular practice at \\
\hline 12 & Q. Is that the testimony? & 12 & Oracle caused the salary differences that were \\
\hline 13 & A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm. & 13 & observed? \\
\hline 14 & Q. Okay. And how does the work needed to & 14 & MR. ELIASOPH: I'm going to object on the \\
\hline 15 & develop those different Oracle products differ; do & 15 & basis that the document speaks for itself. \\
\hline 16 & you know? & 16 & THE WITNESS: No. \\
\hline 17 & A. I don't know. I -- & 17 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 18 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for & 18 & Q. Did you conduct any statistical analysis of \\
\hline 19 & speculation. & & whether any particular practice at Oracle caused any \\
\hline 20 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 20 & of the salary differences that your models \\
\hline 21 & Q. Does work on the different products that & 21 & generated? \\
\hline 22 & Oracle makes require the same skill? & 22 & MR. ELIASOPH: To the extent this asks for \\
\hline 23 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for & & analyses that have not been disclosed, I'm \\
\hline 24 & speculation. Calls for legal conclusion. & & instructing the witness not to answer. \\
\hline 25 & /// & 25 & I do not know if this is part of the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Page 149 & & age 151 \\
\hline 1 analysis that was disclosed, if so then he can go & 1 & Q. What is an onsite as you understand it? \\
\hline 2 ahead and answer, but he can only talk about the & 2 & A. Onsite means -- I cannot remember, you \\
\hline 3 analysis that's been disclosed. & 3 & know. It's -- it's kind of our -- our CO, you know, \\
\hline THE WITNESS: I don't -- I don't know -- & 4 & terview of employees onsite. \\
\hline 5 MS. MANTOAN: So let's -- & 5 & Q. Have you ever participated in an onsite \\
\hline 6 THE WITNESS: Unless I see, you know, my & 6 & while at OFCCP as far as you remember? \\
\hline 7 original report, you know, I-- & 7 & A. Yes, I do. \\
\hline 8 MS. MANTOAN: Well, let's look at & 8 & Q. Okay. Did you participate in the onsite at \\
\hline 9 Exhibit 4. & 9 & Oracle's headquarters' location? \\
\hline 10 THE WITNESS: Exhibit 4. Okay. & 10 & A. I cannot recall, you know. Maybe yes, \\
\hline Y MS. MANTOAN: & 11 & maybe no. I don't know. I think -- hmm, -- \\
\hline 12 Q. So your counsel earlier conveyed his & 12 & MR. ELIASOPH: If you don't know, please \\
\hline 13 understanding that Exhibit 4 presents the results of & 13 & n't speculate. \\
\hline 14 the statistical model that you ran. & 14 & THE WITNESS: Yeah, I should say I don't \\
\hline 15 A. Uh-hm. & 15 & know. \\
\hline 16 Q. Does Exhibit 4 contain any analysis of & 16 & THE REPORTER: Exhibit 5. \\
\hline 17 whether any particular practice at Oracle caused the & 17 & (Exhibit 5 was marked for identification.) \\
\hline 18 salary differences that were observed? & 18 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 19 MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. The document & 19 & Q. So for the record, Exhibit 5 is a document \\
\hline eaks for itself. & 20 & Bates-numbered DOL 38917. \\
\hline THE WITNESS: I don't know. & 21 & o this is an e-mail that was produced to \\
\hline Y MS. MANTOAN: & 22 & us by OFCCP. It's from Brian Mikel. It's to Shauna \\
\hline 23 Q. In conducting the analysis of Oracle's & 23 & lman-Harries. And it says: \\
\hline 24 headquarters' location -- & 24 & "Shauna, Robert Doles will not be available \\
\hline 25 A. Uh-hm. & 25 & for the onsite. In his place Shirong Andy \\
\hline Page 150 & & Page 152 \\
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BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Had you already begun your work on the

Oracle compliance review prior to March of 2015?
A. I cannot recall. I don't know, yeah.
Q. I'm trying to get a sense of -- from the
time you started working on the --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- Oracle headquarters' compliance review
to the time you stopped doing any work in connection
with Oracle's headquarters' location, like, how much
time was that?
Was it a year? Was it a month? How long was it?
A. Sorry, I cannot recall. Yeah.
Q. Is your best estimate that you spent -- you
know, your work on this review, might have spent
more than a year or less than a year?
A. Should be less than a year.
Q. Do you have any better estimate of sort of
when you might have -- like, if you started in the
spring and you ended in the winter, or something
like that?
A. No, I'm sorry. I cannot --
Q. Okay.
A. -- I cannot remember at all.
Q. This is also going to ask you to estimate
'cause I'm sure you don't remember to -- to the
number.
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you give me a sense of roughly the
amount of time you spent, in total, doing work on
evaluation of Oracle's headquarters' location?
Is it less than \(\mathbf{2 0}\) hours? Less than
50 hours? More than 50 hours? More than a hundred
hours?
I'm trying to get the ballpark.
A. I think it's more than probably -- I know
at least -- at least five hours.
Q. At least five?
A. Five hours at least.
Q. Okay. Do you think it was probably less
than 10 hours?
A. Okay, yeah.
Q. Less than 10 ?
A. Less than 10 hours.
Q. Sorry. I want to make sure the record is clear.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Is it your best estimate, as you sit here
today, that in total you spent less than 10 hours in
total working on analyses related to Oracle's
headquarters' location?
A. That was estimate or --
Q. Your best estimate.

MR. ELIASOPH: If you have a clear enough recollection.

THE WITNESS: Uh-hm.
To be honest with you, I don't have very
clear -- very clear, you know, the numbers in my brain, you know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. But you did say you thought it was at least five hours, right?
A. Yeah. I think it's five hours, yeah, but ten, 20, I don't know, I really don't. Five -- five should be reasonable -- you know, at least to five.
Q. Okay. Are you pretty confident that it was fewer than 20 hours?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: I -- I don't know, you know.
MR. ELIASOPH: The witness doesn't remember.

THE WITNESS: Usually as a statistician, right, if I don't have any impression or kind of
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concrete data I don't want to say anything, you
know. You know, so I don't want to estimate like that, you know.

You have information, you estimate. Right now I don't have any --

MR. ELIASOPH: She's entitled to your best estimate --

THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. ELIASOPH: -- if you can give it, but if you don't -- if you're just kind of guessing --

THE WITNESS: Yeah --
MR. ELIASOPH: Then --
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't want to guess, you know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. What's your best estimate of how long you generally spend in connection with any given compliance review doing statistical work?
A. Any -- any kind of --

It depends. Some are like -- one time some time they give me up to one month, then they come back again do the -- you know, come back or communications. So I cannot -- I cannot accurately, you know, sum up, you know, that time.
Q. And I appreciate you can't be precise here,
but I think I am entitied
range -- "The average compliance review I spend 500
to 600 hours on," or "The average compliance review
I might spend 20 hours on."
I want to get a sense of the range, the
ballpark.
A. And in addition each case is unique, so I
don't know, you know. This -- if I get -- the
numbers become kind of guessing, you know, right?
Q. Uh-hm.
A. Each case is unique. So for any case it
might be five hours, some may be seven hours and up.
Right now I cannot total how many case
total I work.
Q. Right.
A. So I'm trying to do average.
Q. No, I'm saying for each case -- I'm saying
for each case, on average, sort of how much you spend per case.
A. Yeah, once I know the number I have to sum up the total cases and divide it by total numbers, then the average.

And right now I cannot help you. I don't
have that kind of number at all.
MR. ELIASOPH: He's a statistician through
and through.
MS. MANTOAN: Right. Okay.
MR. ELIASOPH: Okay. I think that's asked and answered.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. As you sit here today, can you think of any compliance review you've ever done where you've spent 100 hours on a single compliance review?
A. Hundred hours?
Q. Yeah.
A. On a single?
Q. On a single compliance evaluation. Has
that ever happened, as best as you can recall?
A. 100 -- over 100 hours?

MR. ELIASOPH: Don't name it if there is
one. Just -- but you can tell her if there is --
THE WITNESS: Yes, there's one. A long
time ago there's one, yeah.
MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
THE WITNESS: It's --
MS. MANTOAN: Yeah, don't -- I don't need
to know anything about that evaluation.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So in general, you don't -- you don't
regularly spend a hundred hours on a compliance
evaluation?
A. No. No

MS. MANTOAN: Okay. Okay.
MR. ELIASOPH: What number are we on?
THE REPORTER: Six.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(Exhibit 6 was marked for identification.)
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So Exhibit 6, for the record, is a document

Bates-numbered DOL 1362 to DOL 1364.
My first question is whether you ever recall seeing this document before.
A. No. I never -- I never saw this document before.
Q. Okay. Just a few questions about whether you have any understanding of what's meant by some things here.
A. Okay.
Q. In the second full paragraph, that's on the first page, that starts with "The office" --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- it reads:
"The office completed a desk audit review of the compensation data submitted. The results of our analysis indicate
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differences in average compensation that require further investigation of Oracle's compensation practices." Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. So my question is whether you have any understanding of what's meant by "our analysis" here?
A. You know how many hours?
Q. No, what's meant -- what analysis is this referring to? Do you have any idea?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. What analysis is that referring to?
A. This is just, like, in the morning I told you before evaluations the district, they will conduct this analysis. It's called desk audit review.
Q. Desk audit review?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay.
A. That's what they call before evaluations.
Q. Okay.
A. And they maybe used this report to continue another -- whatever work -- whatever, you know, in their side, but I don't know what they do.
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Q. Okay. And then later -- down on this same page continuing over to the next page, there's a
list of \(\mathbf{3 4}\) items.
A. Wow. That's a lot of factors here, yeah.
Q. Do you -- my question is: Do you sort
of -- I know you haven't seen this document
before --
A. No.
Q. -- but does a list like this look familiar
to you requesting this much information?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for
speculation.
THE WITNESS: Some term, I -- you know,
sometime I know, yeah. Some -- I saw somewhere some
term, you know, but all of them -- 34 put all
together like this -- 34 time, right here, right --
34 list?
MS. MANTOAN: Yes.
THE WITNESS: No, I never see this, 34 in
one list like this.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. And in connection with the compliance review of Oracle's headquarters' location were you ever asked "Dr. Leu, what factors" -- "what data do you want us to get for you to do your
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analysis?"
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and
answered and goes to deliberative process privilege.
Please do not answer to the extent you
would disclose any communications you had
predecision on this case.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE REPORTER: Exhibit 7.
(Exhibit 7 was marked for identification.)
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Exhibit 7 for the record is a document

Bates-numbered DOL 1365 to DOL 1366.
It's an e-mail from Shauna Holman-Harries
to Hea Jung Atkins dated October 28th, 2014.
Do you know who Hea Jung Atkins is?
A. I know.
Q. Who is that?
A. It's -- right now she runs -- district
director.
Q. District director?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Do you recall what position she held in

October of \(2014 ?\)
A. Yeah, at that time she's a district director I believe.
Q. Okay. What district is she the director
A. It's --

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.

\section*{BY MS. MANTOAN:}

\section*{Q. As of --}

MR. ELIASOPH: Are you asking now? BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. As of October 2014, do you know what she's the district director of?
A. 2014 -- today is ' 19 , right? ' 14 , I cannot remember so well. I can't remember so well, but I know when I was in there it looked like -- I move from Washington, D.C., to here seven years ago. At that time I just know she is -- at that time she was district director, then after that I never asked her about her position at all.
Q. Okay. You never asked her?
A. But she changed the seat, but I don't know.
Q. I see. Okay.

So the second paragraph in this e-mail starts -- it's cut off, but I believe it says, "When reviewing the item 11 data, please note," and it
goes on.
My question is whether the information in this paragraph -- whether you recall ever receiving the information in this paragraph.

MR. ELIASOPH: So take your time and read the paragraph.

I'm going to object to the question to the extent that it's compound. There's a lot of information in this paragraph. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So I'll ask a slightly different question, while you're reviewing, which is: Do you recall receiving any of the information in this paragraph prior to conducting your statistical analysis?
A. No, I don't receive any information.
Q. Okay.
A. Uh-hm. No -- yeah, no.
Q. And there's a sentence in the middle that I just want to ask about in particular. It starts with the word "please"? It's four lines down.

MR. ELIASOPH: Which one?
MS. MANTOAN: It starts with the word "please." It's four lines down in that paragraph. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. It reads: can vary widely."
A. Yeah. what -- yeah.
BY MS. MANTOAN: statement; is that right?
A. That's right. testimony.

BY MS. MANTOAN: products."
A. Uh-hm. headquarters' location. all.
"Please also note that even for employees appearing in the same job title and the same job department, their work, responsibilities and duties, and employee respective skill and experience typically

Did I read that correctly?
Q. Okay. As you sit here today, do you have any reason to -- do you know of any -- strike that.

As you sit here today, are you aware of any
facts that contradict that statement?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for
speculation. May call for a legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I don't know. I don't know
Q. So as you sit here today, you're not aware of any facts that contradict or undermine that

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Misstates prior
THE REPORTER: Exhibit 8.
(Exhibit 8 was marked for identification.)
THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
Q. So Exhibit 8 is a series of e-mails,

Bates-numbers are DOL 1356 to 1358. And my
questions only concern the most recent e-mail -- the top e-mail on this string, the one on 1356, and the paragraph that begins "Oracle sells many products" -- I'm sorry, "Oracle sells many different

Do you see the paragraph that starts there?
Q. Okay. So I'd like you to read that
paragraph and tell me if you recall receiving any of the information from this paragraph prior to conducting your statistical analysis of Oracle's

MR. ELIASOPH: Vague -- objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
You should not ask me six and seven and eight. I never received this kind of documents at
Q. Right. So my question -- so my question isn't about the specific e-mail necessarily. I see that you're not on the "to" or "from" or "cc"
line --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- but the information that's in this paragraph --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- whether it's from this e-mail or from some other course, I'm trying to understand whether you knew of any of this information at the time you conducted your statistical analysis.
A. No.

MR. ELIASOPH: What -- what specific information are you asking about?

MS. MANTOAN: I mean I can go sentence by sentence in this paragraph, but I'm asking if any of
this information is information that he received prior to conducting his statistical analysis.

MR. ELIASOPH: Well, it refers to job group, job titles, same department, and it's in a narrative form, but some of the information --

I mean it's just very vague. I think it's a confusing question.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I believe so, uh-hm. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. Were you ever -- prior to completing your statistical analysis in this case, were you
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\section*{ever --}

MR. ELIASOPH: All right, he's answered
that he didn't receive this e-mail.
MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So I'm going to ask it -- I'm just going to ask if you were given certain information, which may or may not have come through this e-mail.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Prior to conducting your statistical
analysis in this case were you ever told words to
the effect that because of the diversity in products
sold at Oracle, job group or job title have little
bearing on an employee's pay?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: Nobody told me that. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. Prior to conducting your statistical analysis in this case were you ever told words to the effect that even for employees appearing in the same job group, job title, and/or the same department, their work responsibilities and duties, and employee's respective skill and experience typically can vary widely?

THE WITNESS: No.

\section*{BY MS. MANTOAN:}
Q. Prior to conducting your statistical analysis in this case were you ever told words to the effect that working for a different supervisor will typically denote the different line of business or product the employee is working on?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Prior to conducting your statistical analysis in this case were you ever told words to the effect that different products or lines of business typically require different skill sets?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Prior to conducting your statistical analysis in this case were you ever informed that Oracle does not maintain education or actual work experience in its database?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. When conducting statistical analyses of pay in your work at OFCCP --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- are there times when a factor that you
believe is relevant to pay is not in the data for you to analyze?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation. Calls for legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: No. The management -- you know, I told you in the morning, they send the e-mail for these factors. So I would say no. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. Because you're defining factors that are relevant to pay in that answer as the factors that management tells you to evaluate, correct?
A. Yeah, yeah, yeah -- for Oracle, yeah.

MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Can you scoot over?
MR. ELIASOPH: Oh, am I getting into the --
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Sort of.
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BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Do you know what a show cause notice is in the context of OFCCP?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Do you know if any of your
statistical analyses have ever been included in a
show cause notice?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Confusing.
Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: I don't know any connection, the show cause with an evaluation analysis.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. We talked earlier today about the fact that one way to analyze a compensation is by using cohort comparisons, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And one way to analyze pay is by conducting a statistical analysis, right?
A. (Witness nods head.)
Q. So I have a question -- I just want your opinion on this question based on your knowledge of statistics and your training in statistics.

Do you think it's true that cohart -cohort comparisons are insufficient to rebut statistical evidence of discrimination?
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MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague. Calls for speculation calls for legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: To me, right, to my knowledge, it depends on the case.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. What particularly -- when you say "it depends on the case," what particularly do you mean? On what would it depend?
A. When I say it depends on cases that means because each case is unique. They have their different background, or whatever, the data, nature of the data. So, you know, each company, they're -the data -- the nature of data is unique, so we cannot treat them just as one formula, one type of a cohort analysis. You know.
Q. And did you, yourself, reach any opinions about whether a cohort analysis as opposed to a statistical analysis was the appropriate way to analyze pay at Oracle's headquarter location?
A. You know, to my knowledge -- or to my experience, I usually, by myself -- you know, I don't encourage to do the cohort analysis. I usually just do the evaluations, you know. That's my opinion. But some people they do another review, similar articles, you know, they -- some, they have
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Page 173 & 75 \\
\hline the cons and they have the pro. Depending on the & 1 compliance review of Oracle's headquarters' \\
\hline 2 case, I don't know. I cannot make one conclusion & 2 location? \\
\hline 3 for everything, no. & 3 A. No. \\
\hline 4 Q. Okay. And specifically in connection with & 4 MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent -- \\
\hline 5 the review of Oracle's headquarters' location am I & 5 THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. \\
\hline 6 correct that you never formed an opinion as to & 6 MR. ELIASOPH: Let me -- \\
\hline 7 whether a statistical analysis as opposed to cohort & 7 Objection to the extent that you're asking \\
\hline 8 analysis would be the best way to analyze pay? & 8 for internal deliberations. \\
\hline 9 A. No, I didn't say that, yeah. No, no, I'm & 9 BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 10 sorry, you're right, yeah. I agree with you, yes. & 10 Q. Did you attend any conciliation meeting \\
\hline 11 Q. Okay. What I said was correct? & 11 with Oracle? \\
\hline 12 A. Yeah, yeah, yeah; you said correct, yes. & 12 A. No. \\
\hline 13 MS. MANTOAN: Okay. Thank you. & 13 Q. Were you on any telephone conversations \\
\hline 14 So, Exhibit 9, I believe -- & 14 with anyone from Oracle related to conciliation at \\
\hline 15 Is that the next in order? & 15 the headquarters' location? \\
\hline 16 THE WITNESS: Yes. & 16 A. For conciliation? \\
\hline 17 MS. MANTOAN: -- is a document Bates-number & 17 Q. For conciliation? \\
\hline 18 DOL 940 to 954. & 18 A. No. \\
\hline 19 (Exhibit 9 was marked for identification.) & 19 Q. At any point in connection with the \\
\hline 20 BY MS. MANTOAN: & 20 compliance evaluation did you participate in any \\
\hline 21 Q. And I'll represent to you -- since you said & 21 communications with Oracle? \\
\hline 22 you're not familiar with show cause notices, that & 22 And by "participate" I mean you were a \\
\hline 23 this is the show cause notice that was issued in & 23 direct person in the room or on the phone? \\
\hline 24 connection with the compliance review of Oracle's & 24 MR. ELIASOPH: He testified that he \\
\hline 25 headquarters' locations. & 25 couldn't remember if he was at the compliance \\
\hline And my question for you in & 1 Page 176 \\
\hline And my question for you is just: Do you, & 1 review. You had a document that suggested he was. \\
\hline 2 as a statistician, see any differences between & 2 MS. MANTOAN: Okay. \\
\hline 3 Attachment A to Exhibit 9, that's pages 952 to 954, & 3 MR. ELIASOPH: I just -- to the extent \\
\hline 4 and Attachment A to Exhibit 2, we've talked quite a & 4 you're asking him something he doesn't remember, -- \\
\hline 5 bit about, which is page 1404 to 1406? & 5 MS. MANTOAN: Okay. \\
\hline 6 MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. The documents & 6 MR. ELIASOPH: -- I object. \\
\hline 7 speak for themselves. & 7 MS. MANTOAN: That's a good point. \\
\hline 8 THE WITNESS: I don't know. & 8 BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 9 MR. ELIASOPH: I mean do you want him to do & 9 Q. We did talk about the entrance conference \\
\hline 10 a word-by-word review? & 10 for the onsite and we talked about, yeah, whether or \\
\hline 11 If you represent that they're the same, & 11 not you had attended the onsite. And I think your \\
\hline 12 we'll accept that representation. & 12 testimony was that you didn't remember whether you \\
\hline 13 MS. MANTOAN: Okay. That's fine, then. & 13 were at the onsite; is that correct? \\
\hline 14 BY MS. MANTOAN: & 14 A. Yeah. \\
\hline 15 Q. Do you know what a conciliation meeting is & 15 Q. Setting that to one side, do you remember, \\
\hline 16 in the context of OFCCP? & 16 one way or another, whether you ever participated in \\
\hline 17 A. So-so. & 17 any communications with Oracle related to the \\
\hline 18 Q. Okay. What's your understanding of what a & 18 compliance evaluation of its headquarters' location? \\
\hline 19 conciliation meeting is? & 19 A. No. \\
\hline 20 A. Conciliation means, you know, between -- & 20 Q. You don't remember one way or the other, \\
\hline 21 the conversation between contractor and the OFCCP, & 21 correct? \\
\hline 22 and probably they want to find a better solution for & 22 A. Yeah. \\
\hline 23 both the party. & 23 Q. Okay. \\
\hline 24 Q. Have you -- did you participate in any & 24 MR. ELIASOPH: Just to be clear for the \\
\hline 25 conciliation discussions in connection with the & 25 record, are you saying you didn't or you don't \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


A. Oh.

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague and confusing.

THE WITNESS: And this is too -- too -- I
don't know facts -- what facts are? I really don't
know. It's too wide. I really don't know how to
answer this question.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So l'll represent to you that OFCCP has filed an administrative complaint alleging --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- discrimination in pay --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- at Oracle's headquarters' location.
A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay. And I'm trying to understand what facts you're aware of that relate to whether or not there was discrimination at Oracle's headquarters' location.
A. I don't know. I just simply performed the evaluation and sent back to him -- to her.
Q. In your opinion does the regression that you performed suggest discrimination at Oracle's headquarters' location?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for legal
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conclusion. Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: I sent my result, right?
MS. MANTOAN: Yes.
THE WITNESS: And they -- they make
decision. I don't know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So you're a trained statistician, though, correct?
A. Yeah, I'm statistician, but sometimes
they -- some people, they feel comfortable to make decisions, they don't have to come to me.
Q. Right. So -- yeah, and I'm simply asking
your opinion: Do you believe that the statistical models that you did in the statistical analysis of Oracle's headquarters' location suggest discrimination?

MR. ELIASOPH: This is asked and answered.
It calls for a legal conclusion. It also requires speculation.

THE WITNESS: I don't think I'm an
appropriate person to answer this question, you
know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Why is that?
A. Because, you know, regression is a kind of
systemic check sections but they have another kind
of -- you know, so I cannot just make one
conclusion, "I think you have" -- "you have
discriminations inside of Oracle." Maybe some
people -- some -- another -- like management, they
have to combine many, many pieces of -- to form
pictures. I'm just doing systemic. I don't believe
that the call only based on systemic regression.
It's based on something else. Okay?
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE REPORTER: Exhibit 11.
(Exhibit 11 was marked for identification.)
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. And for the record Exhibit 11 is an 18-page document titled "Second Amended Complaint."

My first question, Dr. Leu, will be if you have ever seen this document before?
A. No.
Q. Okay. If you could turn to page 4 for me.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. You see some statistical results reported there?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay. The question is whether -- do you believe that you did the analysis whose results are
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presented here?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: Yeah --
MR. ELIASOPH: No, no, hold on.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry.
MR. ELIASOPH: Can we go off record for a minute?

MS. MANTOAN: Sure.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record.

The time is \(2: 43 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}\).
(Short recess was taken from 2:43 p.m.
until 2:57 p.m.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record. The time is 2:57 p.m.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Hi, again, Dr. Leu.
A. Hi .
Q. So we were looking at Exhibit 10 which is
the second amended complaint --
Or 11?
MR. ELIASOPH: 11.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. -- 11, is the second amended complaint.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay. And we're looking at page 4 --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- before we went off the record.

My question is whether the statistical results at the bottom of page 4 --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- do those appear to you to be results of
an analysis that you ran?
MR. ELIASOPH: I'm going to object that this requires the witness to speculate.

THE WITNESS: Doesn't look very familiar, you know. I think it's kind of reorganized, mixes some datas, so not directly from my report.

If I were to say there are some from my
report, I think maximum is a page percentage. That
(indicating) column may be from my report. Then after that some people they kick in, like an annual wage lost.

MR. ELIASOPH: And I'm going to object because --

THE WITNESS: I don't know who.
MR. ELIASOPH: -- as counsel is aware, to the extent this line of questions could reveal the identities of outside experts it's protected, and
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communications with them.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So did you, yourself, ever conduct an
analysis that had separate results year by year as
the analysis on page 4 does?
A. Yeah, that's right.
Q. Did you do an analysis that was year by year?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. Uh-huh, no.
Q. Did you do an analysis of any years other than 2014?
A. I don't recall.

MR. ELIASOPH: I'm going to object. The universe of all possible analyses is covered by the deliberative process, the content of specific analyses. You can ask questions with respect to the analyses that were produced.

MS. MANTOAN: Right. This is an analysis that was produced, so I'm trying to find out if this is an analysis that he conducted.

THE WITNESS: No, I don't conduct this analysis, period.

MS. MANTOAN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE REPORTER: Exhibit 12.
(Exhibit 12 was marked for identification.)
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So Exhibit 12 is a multipage document. The Bates-numbers are ORACLE_HQCA_405, 406, and then 407, which is the slip sheet to a native, and I'll represent for the record that the PowerPoint that follows the sheet with the No. 407 is the native
that was produced at that Bates-number, including the notes of the PowerPoint with that Bates-number.

And my question actually does concern the PowerPoint document.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. So starting at the, I guess, fourth page of Exhibit 12, this "Global Compensation Training Managing Pay Module."
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Have you ever seen -- does this document look familiar to you?
A. No.
Q. Do you believe that you have ever seen this document before?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and answered.
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THE WITNESS: Let me see the title.
I don't think so, no. "Global Compensation
Training," no. I do not see this one.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. What understanding, if any, do you have of the factors that managers at Oracle consider when they set pay?
A. Hold on, one second.

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague as to "time period."

THE WITNESS: You say at the Oracle, right?
MS. MANTOAN: Correct.
THE WITNESS: No, I don't know -- I don't know any manager at Oracle.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. And specifically responding to the question: Do you have any understanding of the factors that any manager at Oracle considers when they make pay decisions?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Do you have any understanding of how managers at Oracle make starting pay decisions?
A. No.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Q. Do you have any understanding of the Page 193 & & Q. -- governed compliance reviews as of 2014? \({ }^{\text {Page }} 195\) \\
\hline 2 & different components of compensation that are given & 2 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for legal \\
\hline 3 & to employees at Oracle, what those different & 3 & conclusion. \\
\hline 4 & components are? & 4 & THE WITNESS: Maybe just part, the part -- \\
\hline 5 & A. I got this information from maybe another & 5 & guidelines, you know, for the analysis. \\
\hline 6 & company, but not Oracle. & 6 & (To the reporter) It's part, part, \\
\hline 7 & Q. Okay. Are you familiar with a document & 7 & p-a-r-t, part. \\
\hline 8 & called the "EEOC Compliance Manual"? & 8 & It's not, you know, you have to follow \\
\hline 9 & A. I heard about it. & 9 & something. We have internally -- or also have some, \\
\hline 10 & Q. Do you refer to that document in your work & 0 & like, directive, or whatever -- manual, manual. \\
\hline 11 & as a statistician for OFCCP? & 11 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 12 & A. Do I refer to them? & 12 & Q. The Federal Contractor Compliance manual? \\
\hline 13 & Q. Yes. & 13 & A. Yeah, we still have that, too, yeah. \\
\hline 14 & A. No. & 14 & Q. Okay. \\
\hline 15 & Q. You said, though, you had heard of the EEOC & 15 & A. So this is one of the -- includes some of \\
\hline 16 & Compliance Manual. What do you understand that & 16 & the statistical factor in here, this one. \\
\hline 17 & manual to be? & 17 & Q. So you mentioned Directive 307, you \\
\hline 18 & A. I -- basically I just -- sometime I went to & 18 & mentioned the Federal Contract Compliance manual. \\
\hline & the website and I know they have this kind of stuff, & 19 & Are those two sources that you understood to provide \\
\hline 20 & but I never go inside and read very detail so I & 20 & guidance about how to conduct a compliance review \\
\hline 21 & cannot recall anything. & 21 & related to compensation? \\
\hline 22 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. & 22 & A. Basically, yes. \\
\hline 23 & THE WITNESS: Thank you. & 23 & Q. Okay. Are there any other documents \\
\hline 24 & THE REPORTER: Exhibit 19 -- & 24 & that -- \\
\hline 25 & MS. MANTOAN: Oh, 13? & 25 & A. No. \\
\hline & Page 194 & & Page 196 \\
\hline 1 & THE WITNESS: 13. & 1 & Q. -- you understand to -- \\
\hline 2 & THE REPORTER: 13. & 2 & Okay. Let me finish the question. \\
\hline 3 & THE WITNESS: I would like it, 19. & 3 & Are there any other documents that you \\
\hline 4 & (Exhibit 13 was marked for identification.) & 4 & understand to provide guidance about how to conduct \\
\hline 5 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 5 & a compliance review related to compensation? \\
\hline 6 & Q. Exhibit 13, for the record, is a printout & 6 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it \\
\hline 7 & from a website: & 7 & calls for legal conclusion. \\
\hline 8 & Www.dol.gov/ofccp/regs/compliance/ & 8 & THE WITNESS: Not that I can recall. \\
\hline 9 & directives/dir307.htm. & 9 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 10 & A. Uh-hm. & 10 & Q. Okay. So earlier today, when we were \\
\hline 11 & Q. Now, Dr. Leu, we referred quite a bit in & 11 & talking about Directive 307 -- \\
\hline 12 & today's deposition to Directive 307. & 12 & A. Uh-hm. \\
\hline 13 & A. Uh-hm. & 13 & Q. -- a few times you referred to 13 or 14 \\
\hline 14 & Q. Does Exhibit 13 appear to you to be & 14 & factors. \\
\hline 15 & Directive 307? & 15 & A. Uh-hm. \\
\hline 16 & A. You mean 13? & 16 & Q. And I believe you said that those factors \\
\hline 17 & Q. Correct. & 17 & were in Directive 307. \\
\hline 18 & A. 2013, right? & 18 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objective -- objection. \\
\hline 19 & Q. Oh, I'm asking if Exhibit 13 is & 19 & Misstates prior testimony. \\
\hline 20 & Directive 307. & 20 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 21 & A. Yeah. They have a 307 here (indicating). & 21 & Q. Is that what you -- is that what you said \\
\hline 22 & That's right. & 22 & earlier today? \\
\hline 23 & Q. Okay. And is it your understanding that & 23 & A. No, I didn't -- I didn't say that. \\
\hline 24 & Directive 307 -- & 24 & Q. Okay. \\
\hline 25 & A. Uh-hm. & 25 & A. I said they will -- for example, they will \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
talk about it a little bit, related factors. For
example, we collect the factor, right, maybe involve about industrial or employee, --
Q. Uh-huh.
A. -- the industrial factors --
Q. What do you mean by "industrial factors"?
A. Like their pay structures, job functions.

You provide us job function, right? You
provide us job title, right? Right? That's called
industrial factor.
Q. Okay.
A. Employer -- employee factor means they are, you know, the age.
Q. Employee factors and industrial factors?
A. Yeah. And the other one called an
observable factor. Okay?
Q. Uh-hm.
A. And observe means, the company, they collect those information.
Q. Uh-hm.
A. And they use those to generate a lot of informations, but didn't show in the database, --
Q. Okay.
A. -- so three types.
Q. Okay.
A. In here -- they talk about here, so --
Q. Can you show me where in Directive 307 --
A. Ah.
Q. -- it talks about those different kinds of factors?

MR. ELIASOPH: Take your time.
The directive is pretty long. I'm just
wondering if you need him to identify the specific paragraph, which may require reading it line by line.

MS. MANTOAN: I think he's given pretty detailed testimony that he understands there to be these three buckets of factors that are involved.

THE WITNESS: I think probably, though, it's in \(307-307\) training. When they're training they introduce one and they also have a lot of -- a lot of -- about -- I think it's a PowerPoint. You know, they give us one PowerPoint.

Here they probably reveal that information, but I cannot find here, but -- you know, I forgot who present that training. He or she, you know, lay out -- based on the 307, lay out the PowerPoint.

MS. MANTOAN: They laid it out in a
PowerPoint?
THE WITNESS: PowerPoint, yeah. The title
also is 307 , so maybe I read the 307 or
PowerPoint --
MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
THE WITNESS: -- slide by slide, but -BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. And did that -- the training in that

PowerPoint inform your understanding of how to conduct evaluations of compensation in your work at OFCCP?
A. Yes, outline -- yes, outline that, yeah.

MS. MANTOAN: Okay.
Counsel, is that something that's been produced?

MR. ELIASOPH: Training materials?
MS. MANTOAN: Related to Directive 307 component.

MR. ELIASOPH: I -- I don't have the information to tell you whether that was requested or produced.

MS. MANTOAN: Okay. We can confer about that post-deposition.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So when you were talking about those 13 or 14 factors that you mentioned earlier, do you think -- having now looked at Directive 307 do you
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think those 13 or 14 factors are something you're remembering from that PowerPoint?
A. I don't think they mention a 13 or 14
factor in there but they mention about -- like I
just told you, the industrial factors.
And the other one is -- what I just told you? I forgot already.
Q. You said earlier industrial factors, employee factor, and unobservable (sic) factors.
A. Yeah. Observable -- observable, that's
employee data and observable data is some maybe
factors -- contractor, that they have it, and they use that to generate, you know, employee -- employee data, or whatever, and then it effect --

For example, like the -- like, you know, the -- before the employee come to interview, they can negotiate with the employer about a salary.
Q. Okay.
A. I think the contractor, they have that
portion, and we never get that portion, so that's what we call an observable. And they have quite a few of that, but I cannot remember.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay.
Q. But you -- you used this number 13, 14
several times -- you referred to 13 or 14 factors.
A. Yeah.
Q. And I'm trying to understand what --
A. Okay.
Q. -- where you got that information.
A. Oh. 14 factor I believe come from the
previous -- previous, but after that, you know, we
don't -- we still follow that -- some -- because
contractor sometime they give 14 or 15 . They say
they don't have, they give eight, and we also
analyze because they don't have anything, you know,
so -- but 14, I believe from either -- I cannot
recall -- 289 -- Directive 289 or Directive 275 is
the 14 factor at the time. But right now we
don't -- we don't say "how many factors" as long as,
you know, you say, you know, that's -- as a
statistician, we have more factors is better, you know.

For example, the one you just showed me, 23 -- 33 on the list, you know, I say "I don't
know," you don't remember? The paper you had about 33 or 34 item there.
Q. Yes.
A. Those items can be a factor, too, right?

Yeah, some of them can be a factor, too.
Q. Uh-hm.
A. So if you can have it, you can send
everything to us we appreciate it, too.
Q. What, as a statistician, do you do if
you're trying to analyze compensation in a company
where one or more of the pay factors are
unobservable in the sense that you just described unobservable.
A. Unobservable, right?
Q. Correct.
A. We cannot do because we don't have it.
Q. So what do you do? Do you just not do an
analysis or do you just omit it from the analysis?

\section*{What's your practice?}
A. For example, if you don't have, like, a --
like a prior set of negotiations, right, then we
cannot fit those factor in. We don't have it.
Q. Okay.
A. Right?
Q. Right.
A. So we just base on what we have.
Q. For --
A. And if we -- we base on the contractor tell
us.
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25

1 something that matters for pay is not captured in a
systematized, quantified form?
A. When I talk to -- I ask him -- not --
not -- not tell me, maybe to other people. Like I
say, I just receive the database and perform the regressions. I should not say this part. You know, this is another people's stuff. They ask them and after that they send to me.
Q. Okay. When you receive contractor data is it your -- is it your typical practice to ask any questions to try to understand the contractor's pay system before you run your analysis?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: It depends on the contractor. Case by case different, right?
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. In connection with the compliance review of Oracle's headquarters' location, after you received Oracle's data, did you ask any questions to try to understand Oracle's pay system before you ran your analysis?

MR. ELIASOPH: I'm going to object. That is covered by the deliberative process privilege.

You may not answer that question.

\section*{BY MS. MANTOAN:}
Q. What facts were you aware of before conducting your analysis of Oracle's headquarters' location that describe Oracle's pay system?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: You're talking about location?
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. I'm saying before conducting your analysis of Oracle's headquarters' location --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- what facts were you aware of that described Oracle's pay system?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: No, I don't -- I don't hear. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So the answer is no facts? None?
A. I don't know. I cannot recall.

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I cannot recall that kind of issues, no, I don't --

MR. ELIASOPH: You need to give -- let her finish.

\section*{Page 205}

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. ELIASOPH: Give a moment, let me
finish.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Uh-hm.
MS. MANTOAN: I don't think the record is clear. So I'm going to ask again.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Before conducting your analysis of Oracle's
headquarters' location what facts were you aware of
that described Oracle's pay system?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague, and asked and answered, and ambiguous.

THE WITNESS: I don't -- I'm not aware of any of Oracle's pay system.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So I'm -- I'd like us to look back at

Directive 307, Exhibit 13, and I'm going to go
through some portions of Directive 307 and my questions are just going to be "What, if anything, did you do to perform certain functions or make certain determinations," and if the answer is "nothing," then the answer is "nothing"; or if the answer is "Someone else did it," the answer is "Someone else did it," okay?

So let's go to page 2 of Exhibit 13. And
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I'm looking under the "Policy" paragraph, starts
with No. 5. The second paragraph under there starts
with the words "OFCCP enforces Executive
Order 11246," okay? And then I guess it's the third sentence in that paragraph starts with "COs."

Do you see where I am there?
A. (Witness nods head.)
Q. So this sentence says:
"COs tailor the compensation investigation and analytical procedures to the facts of the case as appropriate under Title VII."
And I appreciate that you are not a CO, meaning compliance officer, but leaving that to the side, what, if anything, did you do to tailor the compensation investigation analytical procedures you used in your analysis of Oracle's headquarters' location to tailor that work to the facts of the case?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Assumes -assumes facts. Requires speculation and is confusing.

THE WITNESS: No, I don't do the tailor --
the tailor stuff, you know.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Did you do anything to tailor your
analytical procedures to any facts specific to Oracle's headquarters' location?
A. No.

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Will you turn to page 4. I'm looking at the definition of "Factors" here on the top of page 4. It's "Directive 307 defines factors as elements which are proposed to explain differences" --

THE REPORTER: I need you to slow down. Sorry.

MS. MANTOAN: Thank you for letting me know.

Factors is defined as:
"Elements which are proposed to explain differences in employee compensation under a contractor's compensation system and practices."
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. And my question for you is: What facts were you aware of, prior to conducting your statistical analysis of Oracle's headquarters' location, that relate to Oracle's compensation practices?
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MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague. Calls for legal conclusion and requires speculation.

THE WITNESS: I don't know how to answer this. It's too wide for me. The question too wide. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Do you have an understanding, as you read Directive 307, of what is meant by a "contractor's compensation system and practices"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What does that mean?
A. It's just, you know, this will be our guidance, you know, to perform the regressions. That's what I understand.
Q. Okay. And at the time you conducted your regression analysis of Oracle's headquarters' location, did you have any factual information available to you about Oracle's compensation practices?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Can you address the question in -- from another angle? I really cannot -- you know, maybe the language, you know, gap. I don't know what you really want to know for these questions, you know.
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THE WITNESS: So what your -- what your question exactly?
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So I'm trying to see what you understand the phrase "pattern or practice" to mean as used here in Directive 307?
A. Oh, okay. Pattern means do they have the kind of neutral -- they have a neutral and unneutral for this case in terms of pay. Do they have in between, or this is nonneutrals, you know.
Q. And what do you mean by neutral or nonneutral? Is that -- do you have a specific quantitative outcome in mind?
A. Neutral means because -- neutral means they don't against -- it's just -- not statistical significant basically is a neutral.
Q. And when you --
A. Against a female, they don't acts against a male or statistical significance standard deviation is a two, right?

THE REPORTER: Statistical significant...
THE WITNESS: Significance -- significance, yeah.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. And then standard, did you say?
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\section*{A. Yeah.}
Q. What was that?
A. Standard deviation is a two, right -- if
less than two -- if standard deviation less than two, then it's neutral, it's neutral.

If absolute value greater than two, then they are not --

THE REPORTER: I -- I'm --
THE WITNESS: Okay. This is statistician term. I'm sorry.

MS. MANTOAN: Yeah, if the --
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Could you just say it again, please?

MR. ELIASOPH: Just say it slowly.
THE WITNESS: Okay. If abso- abso---
absolute standard deviations --
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Absolute standard deviations.
A. A-b-s-o-l-o-u-t-e (sic).
Q. Yeah.
A. Absolute -- absolute.
Q. Uh-hm.
A. Standard deviation's greater than two.
Q. Within two?
A. Greater -- greater --
Q. Greater than two?
A. -- greater than two, --
Q. Okay.
A. That is nonsense -- nonneutral, okay?

So the pattern means that we want to see
they have nonneutral pattern or not, something like that, yeah.
Q. And as you apply Directive 307 in your work
at OFCCP would you consider there to be a pattern or
practice in the data if one analysis flagged as
nonneutral but other analyses of the same company at
the same location flagged as neutral?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for
speculation. Calls for legal conclusions.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, it occurs, you know.
It occurs sometimes, yes.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. And in -- as you apply Directive 307 in
your work at OFCCP would you consider that to be
evidence of a pattern or practice of discrimination?
A. Oh --

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for legal
conclusion. Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: That's just only one
indicator. We have to pursue another kind of
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evidence. The regression is only tool, yeah. It's
kind of reference, you know. And standard deviation
non-neutral doesn't say, "Oh there is a disparity in
there or not," no.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Why -- why is that?
A. It's systemic.
Q. What did you say? I'm sorry.
A. This is just a systemic, but then like I
say, earlier we talk about "cohort," right?
Sometime cohort -- you can use the cohort statistic
analysis to find out, you know.
So you have to check both, on systemic --
which is a regression, right?
Q. Systemic, which is regression.
A. Which is regressions --
Q. Uh-hm.
A. And then another statistics to find
something -- because systemic is talk about average, is talk about average. So average, that doesn't
mean say is no distribution in whole organizations.
Okay?
Q. Okay. So I don't know if you'll be happy or not happy, I did actually find your dissertation and I read it. I don't know when the last time you
read your dissertation was.
A. Oh. You found my dissertation?
Q. I did.
A. You understand what I'm talking about?
Q. Yeah.
A. Really? What am I doing?
Q. Well, you're running different tests on small sample sizes to determine --
A. Yeah --
Q. -- which one is --

MR. ELIASOPH: Don't let the flattery --
don't let the flattery get to you.
MS. MANTOAN: So I-- I mean we can introduce it as an exhibit. I don't think I need to. I just -- I'll represent to you that I read a sentence in your dissertation and wanted to understand what you mean by it. So...
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. I read a sentence that said, "Failure to reject the null hypothesis is not evidence that it is true."
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Do you agree with that sentence?
A. Say again. I just -- you know...
Q. "Failure to reject the null" n-u-I-I,
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        MR. ELIASOPH: Just objection. Vague.
        THE WITNESS: Uh-hm.
    BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. What does that sentence mean?
A. Okay. You said "reject the null
hypothesis"?
Q. "Failure to reject the null hypothesis" --
A. Yeah, this is something --
Q. -- "is not evidence that the null
hypothesis is true."
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. This is speculation.

The -- if you remember exactly what you
were saying and how that came you can answer that.
THE WITNESS: No. I don't want to answer this --

MR. ELIASOPH: Do you know the context?
THE WITNESS: -- because, you know, the hypothesis, right, sometime they have negative negative.

THE REPORTER: I need you to slow down.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
Hypothesis is testing. Sometime they have negative negatives still in there. And then my
language -- you know, English is not my second
language, you know. Sometimes you have to rewrite
in another statement. You know, like the statistic
statement sometime you can rewrite in a way, so
I'm -- I'm not going to jump in to answer this
question right away if I cannot make sure hundred
percent accurate for you.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. Have you ever published any work in a peer-reviewed journal?
A. Peterson -- Peter -- just one time in ASA.

It's kind of -- it's kind of -- I don't know. It's
a public presentations in ASA. It's --
Let's see, I don't know, I forgot.
Q. Are you thinking of a presentation on the use of the Peters-Belson method in a hiring discrimination --
A. Yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah.
Q. What was that about?
A. Oh, well, that's just talk about the -- you know, that each company is unique so they have their own distributions, you know, the model, it's a company of their own. And I try to find out if the model should -- depends on the size of the sample or not.

Page 220
So, for example, if we -- these methods, if we use base on the 530 --
Q. Based on the 530, is that what you said?
A. -- 530, and different models and we do the
simulations -- I cannot recall everything, you know,
so that's long time ago, and try to find out what
the best sample size we have to use, you know, for
the analysis.
MR. ELIASOPH: It's "sample" size.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Could we look back at Directive 307?
A. Sure, please.
Q. Okay. Page 10. I'm looking at the second full paragraph. Starts with "The CO should tailor."
A. Second paragraph?
Q. Second complete paragraph. So the one that
begins "The CO should tailor."
A. Uh-hm.
Q. So the first sentence of that is:
"The CO should tailor the approach and tools to be used based on the contractor's compensation practices."
And my question is: Is that -- is that
sentence consistent with the training you've been
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provided about how to conduct compliance reviews for
OFCCP?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Calls for speculation. Vague.

THE WITNESS: I think this question should -- the CO answer the question, you know, not me.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 14. So, my
question concerns the paragraph beneath the graphic on page 14.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. That sentence reads:
"The mere fact that there are pay
differences between comparators without any
other evidence of pretext or other indicia
of possible discrimination generally is not
sufficient to find a violation of Executive Order 11246."
My question is: Is that statement consistent with the training you've received in connection with your work at OFCCP?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. Furthermore, objection, calls for speculation.
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THE WITNESS: Bless you.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: What do you mean
"comparators" right here?
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Do you have an understanding of what's
meant by comparators in that sentence?
A. No, I don't know comparators indicated in
this sentence -- "between comparators." It means
the model? No, right?
Q. Well, you said earlier that you looked to Directive 307 --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- to help understand how to do your work at OFCCP, correct?
A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm.

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Misstates prior testimony.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Is it correct that you look to

Directive 307 to help you do your work at OFCCP?
A. Yeah. I -- yeah. Basically I look at the

PowerPoint version, you know, not this version
(indicating), so...
Q. Okay. Do you have any understanding of
what the word "comparators" means in this section of Directive 307?

MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague and calls -- and object to the extent it calls for legal conclusion.

MS. MANTOAN: Let me ask a slightly
different question.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. What is your understanding, if any, of the word comparators as used in this section of Directive 307?

MR. ELIASOPH: I'm going to object that it calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I need you probably to re-address the question.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So the question is just: Do you -- do you have an understanding of what that word means --
A. Okay.
Q. -- as used here in Directive 307?

MR. ELIASOPH: Same objections.
THE WITNESS: Okay. No, I know the comparators, but I still cannot -- hold on, the complete sentence, "without any other evidence or pretext, or other indicia" --

What are indicia? The index approvals?
"Other indicia," I don't know what indicia is.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. I really wanted to understand if you
had an understanding of that sentence as you applied
Directive 307. It sound like you -- you don't have
any particular understanding of it; is that right?
A. I -- most of them, yeah -- I understand
most -- most of them, but some specific sentence I
don't know, yeah.
MS. MANTOAN: Okay. Can we take a quick break?

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record.

The time is \(3: 44\) p.m.
(Short recess was taken from 3:44 p.m.
until 3:57 p.m.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record.

The time is 3:57 p.m.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So, Dr. Leu, I wanted to --
A. Yes.
Q. Oh, did you have something to say?
A. Oh, no.
Q. Oh, okay. I wanted to look back at

Exhibit 4, please.
A. Okay. Exhibit 4. 10, 12, one, three, eight, six, five -- okay, four, here. Okay.
Q. And Exhibit 4, as we've discussed
previously, contains some results of a statistical analysis, right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. I want to make sure I'm understanding --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- the results of this analysis that I'm
seeing here.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. So let's turn first to the second page in
the document, which is Bates-number DOL 5299.
A. This one (indicating)?
Q. Correct. The number is --
A. I think this is right.
Q. If you hold it landscape orientation, it's the number on the bottom right.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay.
A. What's the number? 5--
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Q. 5299.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. So starting at the first row that's not redacted or obscured --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- that row talks about the pay analysis
group Info Tech, correct?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay. And the total count for females in that row is 133 , correct?
A. Usually -- it looks like this is the race,
you know -- looks like race. 484, 351, 133 can
be -- can be the race because they have a dot, dot,
dot, dot, dot. They call it race, they have a five different kind -- different type of race.
Q. Uh-hm.
A. And some race they don't meet the 35
(sic) --
Q. \(30 / 5\) ?
A. -- \(30 / 5\) for evaluations and that would produce the dot, dot, dot, dot.
Q. Okay. But this is a gender --

MR. ELIASOPH: Where do you see the dot, dot, dot, dot, dot?
//I
```

BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. -- analysis, correct?
A. I know, but you just cut it. You
have gender, I know but sometimes gender is right
here. They have something there.
Q. So this is how this was produced to us by
OFCCP. So, --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- maybe this will help. Can we look at
Exhibit 2, Attachment A?
A. Attachment A.
Q. Page }1404
A. Yeah.
Q. So the results there for females in
Information Technology indicates a count of women of
133, correct --
A. Okay.
Q. -- in Exhibit 2?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. And in Exhibit 4, on page 5299, the number
of women indicated is 133, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. And in Exhibit 2, Attachment A, the
standard deviation for women in Info Tech is
negative 2.71, correct?
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    A. 2.7 -- yeah, correct.
    Q. And in Exhibit 4, page 5299, --
    A. Uh-hm. Right.
    Q. -- the standard deviation for woman in Info
    Tech is negative 2.71, correct; if you round down?
    A. 2. -- 2.7 ?
    Q. For women in Information Technology --
    A. Yeah -- yeah, yeah.
    Q. Okay.
    A. 2.71, right?
    Q. Yeah.
    A. Okay.
        Q. So the pages we're comparing in Exhibit 2
    are Bates-number 1404, --
    A. Uh-hm.
    Q. -- and in Exhibit 4 is Bates-number 5299?
    A. Okay.
    Q. Okay.
    A. All right. Looks like --
    Q. Does this look -- does Exhibit 4,
    page 5299, appear to contain additional detail about
    the analysis reported in Exhibit 2, page 1404?
        MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. Vague.
        THE WITNESS: And how come they're empty
    here?
```

BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So that's -- that's a strikeout that was
made before this document was provided to Oracle by
OFCCP and that was made by OFCCP I believe pursuant
to a claim of privilege.
MR. ELIASOPH: Correct.
THE WITNESS: I really cannot explain it if
they're not complete. I really -- I don't want to
make a mistake because the CS report I produce is
kind of easy to understand, complete. You know,
this kind of take some part, cut here, take some
part here (indicating), so I cannot recognize
very -- even your numbers is -- match, right, but
I'm still, you know, kind of wondering.
You should put the complete. I don't
know --
MR. ELIASOPH: We -- we withheld that
because our claim is privilege.
THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.
So what's your question?
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. I'm trying to establish whether or not you
believe that the results reported in Exhibit 2,
page 1404, are the same results that are reported in
Exhibit 4, page 5299, the same analysis, the same
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    number of women, the same standard deviations, the
    same job function.
    A. "Information Technology, Information
    Technology, Product Development, Product
    Development."
    Okay, yeah, I think that's probably the
same thing because --
    Q. Okay.
    A. -- 133 is the same, 1,207 , and then they
    don't have 47 right here (indicating).
    Q. So if you turn to the next page in
    Exhibit 4, 5300 --
    A. Ah -- oh, this 47 is right here.
    Minus three -- okay, yeah.
    Q. Okay.
    A. They match with this Attachment A, that's
    correct.
    Q. Okay.
    A. Yeah.
    Q. Thank you. So now a few questions about
    some information in Exhibit 4.
    A. Uh-hm.
    Q. So, on the -- on page 5299 -- we're back in
    Exhibit 4, we're looking at the line for pay
    analysis group Info Tech, which has the 133 women in
it.
A. 133, okay.
Q. Okay. And then there's a column where the header at the top is "Female Model R Square" --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- and the number is 0.8450 ?
A. That's correct.
Q. What does that mean to you?
A. It means the model can explain how they
evaluate the pay with about 84.5 percent.
Q. The model explains 84.5 percent of vari- --
A. Yeah, of --
Q. Let me finish the question.
A. Okay. Sorry.
Q. You interpret that number to mean that the model explains 84.5 percent of the variation in pay, correct?
A. Yeah, yeah. Or I can say another way is
about 6 -- 13.5 percent not explained, or
unexplained, by the model.
Q. Wouldn't it be \(\mathbf{1 5 . 5}\) percent?
A. No, it's -- 15.5 , yes -- 15.5 , yes. \(100-\) -
Q. Okay.
A. -- minus 84 , yes.
Q. And what does that mean for some percent of
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the pay to not be explained by the model?
A. Well, just we -- we just don't have -- you
know, usually 84.5 is very high already, you know --
it's very high percentage here already, you know,
but the unexplained means some of the variation, you
know, the data cannot explain --
Q. Okay.
A. -- the factor cannot explain.
Q. The factors included in the model cannot explain that part?
A. Cannot -- cannot -- yeah, cannot -- some part --

So this is the whole, whole reason here is 100 percent, right?
Q. Uh-huh?
A. And only 84 percent the factor can explain, the maximum the factor can explain is 84 with that model --
Q. Okay.
A. -- with that specific model.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. And what does it mean -- again, on
page 5299, Exhibit 4. There's a Female Model R Square number in this Info Tech row of .8450, and
then there's a Model R Square number of .8430. What is the difference between the Female Model R Square and the Model R Square?

MR. ELIASOPH: Between this (indicating) and this (indicating).

THE WITNESS: Okay. I don't know, they got this one model, female R.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So I guess the question is ambiguous.

On some level the difference between them is just .002. I'm not asking what the numeric difference is. I'm asking what do those concepts connote or mean?
A. Okay. Usually regression we have a two --
Q. And can you answer slowly just so I can make --
A. Okay.
Q. -- sure I understand.
A. Usually we perform the regressions they provide a tool Model \(R\) statistics. One is called an overall. It's overall, including any factors; and the other one is for the estimate, you know, estimate, like that, but here I think probably they talk about Adjust R Square.
Q. Which one do you understand to be the

\section*{Adjusted R Square?}
A. I think usually -- Adjust R square usually
is lower than the regular Model R Square, female
model will usually be lower because, you know, the
factor and the factor, probably they have correlated.
Q. Okay.
A. And especially if you put more than
expected factors, then \(R\)-- just \(R\) Square will go
down a little bit.
Q. Okay.
A. So we don't want -- if you put too much -too many other factors and you -- they cause R Adjust Square to go down very lot --
Q. Uh-hm
A. -- usually about 10 percent.
Q. Uh-hm
A. Then you have to adjust which factor should
be in the model, which one should not be in the model -- should in and should not be in the model.
Q. And that's a concept known as
overspecification, correct?
A. Over what?
Q. Overspecification.
A. Yeah, yeah. It's kind of
overspecification. Yeah, it's model specification,
yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. Model specification.
Q. Are there other statistical tests that you can or do perform in your work at OFCCP to determine whether the model you're using is well specified?
A. Oh, okay. You know, they have -- the VIF.
Q. What is that?
A. VIF is --
Q. Can you just say --
A. Variance inflation factor.
Q. Variance in what? Can you spell that for
me?
A. Inflation -- inflat- -- like inflation,
like a tire inflation, right? So --
MR. ELIASOPH: Inflation?
THE WITNESS: Yeah -- inflation, yes.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Variant inflation --
A. Variance --
Q. Variance inflation factor.
A. -- inflation factor.
Q. Factor, okay.
A. This one will be -- make sure you don't put
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too many factor over -- over the factors in your models. That indicate -- if you indicate over than
10, some, you know, this is some author say may be over than 40. It depends how many of them over than that, you know. If you over than 10 , have several of the factor, right, over than that, then you have to -- probably have to withdraw. You have to decide which factor to be in and which one to get out.
That's the statistician job.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. And did you do any of that work in connection with your evaluation of Oracle's headquarters' location?
A. Oh, yeah, yeah. It's a -- we have built in -- we have built in --

I'm sorry.
MR. ELIASOPH: Okay. Just we're going to talk about what's been produced and not everything we ever did.

THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.

\section*{BY MS. MANTOAN:}
Q. This is a question about a test that you did on the results that you did report out, right?
A. Usually we don't produce, like, a VIF on a
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Page 237 & & Page 239 \\
\hline & report, no. It's just ourselves diagnosis, we -- & & A. So we use a normal plot. \\
\hline & you know -- & & Q. And when you say "residuals" you're \\
\hline 3 & Q. Okay. & 3 & plotting what the model -- \\
\hline 4 & A. It automatically programmed, but we can see & 4 & A. Residuals -- residuals. \\
\hline 5 & the result, but we don't produce that. & 5 & Q. Let me-- can I? \\
\hline 6 & THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I need you to & & A. I'm sorry, l'm sorry, I'm sorry. \\
\hline 7 & slow down. & 7 & Q. -- finish the question? \\
\hline 8 & It just... & & A. Sorry. Sorry. Sorry. \\
\hline 9 & THE WITNESS: We just -- you know, it's & 9 & Q. When you're analyzing residuals you're \\
\hline 10 & automatic program, right, and it produced the & 10 & otting the pay that the model predicts for a given \\
\hline 11 & statistics that the statistician to make sure -- to & 11 & person against their actual pay; is that right? \\
\hline 12 & verify if the model is good model or not good model, & 12 & A. That one also can do and then another test \\
\hline 13 & but we don't produce any -- that type of statistic & & or two. That one is another test, but it also can \\
\hline 4 & in the paper. & & ake sure, you know, a good model or not good model, \\
\hline 15 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 15 & but we use it with the normal plot. \\
\hline 16 & Q. So you just referred to that variance & 16 & Q. Okay. And did you conduct a normality \\
\hline 17 & inflation factor look as a kind of self-diagnosis. & 17 & check in connection with your analysis of the data \\
\hline 18 & Are there other kinds of statistical self-diagnostic & 18 & for Oracle's headquarters' location? \\
\hline 9 & tests that you typically run? & 19 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection. To the extent \\
\hline 20 & A. Okay, we do the -- like a nomanity (sic) & & ch an analysis is not reported here, it would be \\
\hline 21 & check. & 21 & ivileged. \\
\hline 22 & Q. Nomanity? & 22 & MS. MANTOAN: And you would instruct not to \\
\hline 3 & A. Nomanity check. & 23 & swer on that basis? \\
\hline 24 & Q. Normality? & 24 & MR. ELIASOPH: Yes. \\
\hline 25 & A. Normanity check. & 25 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. \\
\hline & Page 238 & & Page 240 \\
\hline 1 & Q. What does that entail? & & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 2 & A. Usually everybody that knows statistic is & 2 & Q. Let's go back to page 5299 and look again \\
\hline 3 & very interesting. We -- before we do, we assume & 3 & at that same row for Information Technology with the \\
\hline 4 & they meet our assumptions. & 4 & 133 women. \\
\hline 5 & Q. Right. There are assumption -- & & A. Uh-hm. \\
\hline 6 & A. Actually they're not. & 6 & Q. There's a number here in the column with \\
\hline 7 & Q. Yes. & 7 & the header "Female Impact," which is negative \\
\hline 8 & A. So after that we do some diagnose. So & 8 & 2470.90. \\
\hline 9 & nomanity -- & 9 & Did I read that correctly? \\
\hline 10 & Q. Normality. & 10 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 11 & A. -- the plot will tell us -- we see if you & 11 & Q. Okay. What does that number mean? \\
\hline 12 & still have the trend. It means that your model is & 12 & A. That means, you know, they have disparity \\
\hline 13 & not complete. & 13 & against the female. Okay. And average -- you know, \\
\hline 14 & Q. Okay. Is your normality test a plot of & 14 & the average disparity against the female is \\
\hline 15 & residuals? & 15 & \$ compared to the men. \\
\hline 16 & A. Let's talk about -- you asked me earlier & 16 & Q. You said that's an average number, correct? \\
\hline 17 & you talk about trends -- systemic trend, right? & 17 & A. Average, yes -- average, yeah. \\
\hline 8 & Q. Yes. & 18 & Q. Does that number tell me anything about any \\
\hline 9 & A. So our data cannot completely to explain & 19 & pay disparity impacting any particular woman in the \\
\hline & the trend, so those residuals will remain on the & 20 & data? \\
\hline 21 & data. That's what we call residuals. & 21 & A. No. \\
\hline 22 & Q. Yes. & 22 & Q. On the same page, 5299, I want to look down \\
\hline 3 & A. And we can form a residual to find out the & 23 & at the row where the pay analysis group is indicated \\
\hline 24 & model is a good model or not good model. & 24 & as "PRODEV." \\
\hline 25 & Q. Okay. & 25 & Do you understand that to mean product \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

development?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay. And here there were 1,207 females in
the analysis, correct?
A. Correct, yeah.
Q. And that's the same as indicated in the
NOV, Exhibit 2, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And the standard deviations that the
model generated were negative 8.40-- -41, if you
round up, correct?
A. Uh-hm,uh-hm.
Q. And that's the same number reported in the
NOV, Exhibit 2.
A. Uh-hm,uh-hm.
Q. Correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Sorry, I just need you to answer audibly --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- instead of "uh-hm." I just need a "yes"
or "no."
I see the Female Model R Squared in this
row is 0.7759.
A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm.
MR. ELIASOPH: Remember to --

```
BY MS. MANTOAN:
    Q. Is that "yes"?
    MR. ELIASOPH: -- say "yes."
    THE WITNESS: Yes.
    MS. MANTOAN: Okay. And is -- "yes" or
"no."
    MR. ELIASOPH: Let her finish -- let her
finish before you make any sound.
    MS. MANTOAN: Yeah, an audible answer --
    THE WITNESS: Yes.
    MS. MANTOAN: -- will be easier for the
    reporter.
    THE WITNESS: Okay.
    MS. MANTOAN: Thank you.
    BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So the Female Model R Square in this row for product development --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- is less than the Female Model R Square in the row for Information Technology, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. What does that mean to you?
A. Means the same model, right, they only can explain the product development 77 percent and -but they can explain -- they can explain more for
the Information Tech with 84.550 percent.
Q. Does that mean that the model doesn't fit the product development data as well as it --
A. Well, --
Q. Oop, can I finish the question?
A. Oh, I'm sorry.
Q. Does that mean that the model does not fit
the data in product development as well as it fits
the data in IT?
A. This is difficult to answer. Let's see.

You can say that, too, you know, because same model,
so it can explain more in the Info Tech than the
product development. That's true, yes. Yes.
MS. MANTOAN: Okay. Can we go off the record for one minute?

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record.

The time is \(4: 17\) p.m.
(Short recess was taken from 4:17 p.m.
until 4:23 p.m.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record.

The time is \(4: 23\) p.m.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So, Dr. Leu, turning over to page 5300 in
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\section*{Exhibit 4.}
A. Yep, 5300, yes.
Q. Does this appear to contain information on the results for the support job function?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. And there's 47 women indicated in Exhibit 4, correct?
A. No, this -- yeah, okay, yeah, that's right, yeah.
Q. And the standard deviations are negative
3.67 if you round up?
A. Yes.
Q. And those are the same as the NOV,

Exhibit 2, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Okay. Can we turn a bit further
past a number of blanked out pages to the page that ends with \(5308 ?\)
A. Okay.
Q. And can you confirm that the analysis on
page 5309 -- continuing over to 5309 is an analysis
of race and compensation in the products development job function?
A. Uh-hm, yeah.
Q. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. What is the -- I'm going to ask you what these column headings mean. What is the b-Coefficient?
A. B-Coefficient will be the column right to the label, this one (indicating), so this is the coefficient.
Q. But what is a b-Coefficient? Like what does that statistical term mean?
A. It's an estimate.
Q. Estimate of what?
A. For the female factor -- estimate for the factor, coefficient for the factor.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. So is it best understood as the -- the --
it's what the model estimates that an additional
unit of that factor means for pay, right?
So full-time status increases -- full-time status is one versus zero since the b-Coefficient is .48, the model is estimating an increase in pay?
A. Yes.
Q. Correct?
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A. Yes.
Q. Is that a 48 increase in pay?
A. No. This one -- this one they used. It's

40 percent in -- yes, yes, okay, 48 percent.
If they are full-time status, average they
will get 48 percent more than the people who are not
in a full-time status.
Q. Okay. And the "SD," that column heading, means standard deviations, correct?
A. That's right. In the last --
second-to-the-right column.
Q. Second from the right is the standard deviations?
A. Yeah, is a standard deviation.
Q. Okay. And what does the column all the way to the right mean? I see the heading at the top of the page, but I do not know what that means.
A. That one usually the same as standard deviation, but they just write in the probability term.
Q. "Probability"?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay. So l've heard sometimes roughly
people describe two standard deviation as --
A. . 05 .
Q. -- roughly equivalent to a probability
value of . 05 --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. So that's the relationship that's present
here, correct?
A. Yeah. Yeah.
Q. Okay. I see that the b-Coefficient on
"Years at Company" is negative?
A. Which one?
Q. Years at company?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. What does it mean that the b-Coefficient is negative on years at company?
A. Ah, that's a good question. Sometime, you
know -- sometime if we put too much of the -- for
example, the factor must be independent. We call
independent factor, right? So sometime we say "Have
to independent to each other."
Q. Oh, sorry. Could you slow down so I could understand.
A. When we do the regressions that each factor should be independent to each other, but for an actual situation that never happened --
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\section*{Q. Okay.}
A. Okay.

THE REPORTER: For a?
MS. MANTOAN: For that --
THE WITNESS: For a -- for a actual -actual --

MS. MANTOAN: Actual situation --
THE WITNESS: -- situation that never happened that way, so there is kind of -- you know, there's the room to do like that.

And I have to go back to check what -- they have a reason to become negative .01 . They're very close to that, you know. Is that usually zero-point-something, you know, something a range, you know. It's a -- usually, right, can be tentative factors, but because the -- you know, management they weren't in, I have to put in.
Sometime they're tentative. Sometime --
Q. What is that word? Sorry.
A. Tentative. Like, for example, not
complete.
Q. Tentative?
A. Tentative, yeah -- well, not complete, later like that.

So usually -- this one, right, usually,
like -- I have to go check, you know, to see what
factors cause that.
Q. Okay. But the -- but the model in

Exhibit 2 --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- includes years at company --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- as a variable, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. This EO Company -- let me see. Hold on a second.
-- yes, it's in there, so...
Q. Okay. So, I think this is right, but tell me if not.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. So the model that you used to assess pay differences by race --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- in the product development job
function --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- ended up predicting that people who had worked at Oracle longer --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- would earn less money than people --- 250
MR. ELIASOPH: Andy, --
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. -- who had worked at Oracle less?

MR. ELIASOPH: Andy, you need to stop
talking --
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. ELIASOPH: -- until she's done.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. ELIASOPH: You don't need to agree while she's talking.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MS. MANTOAN: Right.
MR. ELIASOPH: Let her finish.
MS. MANTOAN: You can -- yeah, let me know at the end of the question if you've understood or not.

THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Okay. So the model that you used to assess pay differences by race --
A. Uh-hm.
Q. -- in the product development job
function --
A. Uh-hm.
1

MR. ELIASOPH: Okay. You're doing it again.

THE WITNESS: No -- oh.
MS. MANTOAN: Let me start again.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. The model that you used to assess pay differences by race in the product development job
function ended up predicting that people who had
worked at Oracle longer would earn less money than
people who had worked at Oracle for less time, correct?
A. So average, yeah, average, yeah. That's -you know.
Q. On average that's correct, yes?
A. On average, yeah -- yes.
Q. Okay. Did you do anything, upon seeing
that result, to try to understand why you were seeing that result?
A. Yeah -- yeah, usually I would check, yeah.
Q. What does a check entail?
A. I checked the model, you know. Because for most of the factor, right, still fit the model.
It's just only one factor small little bit datas,
usually if I say -- probably I say they also -- they
have some data, right? It's kind of -- it's
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tentative, you know, so they move the model
equations -- they move the model equations a little
bit, you know, but because in terms of whole model,
is still very strong, you know, as we are still very
high and they don't have the multicollinear situation.
Q. Multicollinearity.
A. Yeah, multicollinear is too serious for that.
Q. Uh-hm.
A. So I think this model still, you know, good model, so that's why.
Q. Did you do that check at that time or are you saying that's something you could imagine yourself having done?
A. Yeah, I see -- we are not just only this one negative. The negative too much. Maybe they have tentative. They have tentative. Then we'll -I will reconduct the -- the models.

This one just about \(0.01,0.01,0.01-\) yeah, 0.01, yeah, 0.01 .
Q. Okay.
A. Very -- very small, you know.
Q. Is it surprising to you that the
coefficient is negative, though?


Q. Okay.

A. Uh-hm.

Q. So even looking at Exhibit 2, Exhibit 3,
 Exhibit 4 --

A. Uh-hm.

Q. -- you're unable to determine how that
 prior proxy adjust factor was constructed, right?

A. No, I have to go see my stuff.

Q. So it's correct that you're not able to
 determine it from what you have in front of you,
 correct?

A. That's right.

MS. MANTOAN: Okay. So, Counsel, we could
 have a discussion off the record, but I will just
 put on the record that I think we've -- we've been
 back and forth with respect to various statistical
 analyses about seeing the backup to the statistical
 analysis, or sort of how the sausage was made, and
 it sounds like Dr. Leu is testifying that the
 information produced today does not allow us to
 understand exactly how the analysis underlined in
 the NOV was constructed.

BY MS. MANTOAN:

Q. Moving down to the lines under prior proxy
 adjust it says --
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A. Which exhibit? No. 4.
Q. I am in Exhibit 4, back at page 5309.
A. 5309, okay.
Q. The line -- two under "Prior Proxy Adjust"?
A. Okay.
Q. Says "Ethnicity-A."
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Do you understand that to mean Asian?
A. It's Asian, yes.
Q. Okay. And this shows standard deviations of negative 6.55?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. And then the b-Coefficient is negative .04, correct?
A. Uh-hm, uh-hm.
Q. That means that the model was finding, on average, a four percent pay difference between Asians and Whites, adverse to Asians, correct?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. Okay. And when we were looking at the

R-squared before, for the product development job function, we found that it was something around 77 percent, correct?
A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay. So am I right, then, in
understanding that the model that you ran for
product development left 23 percent of pay
unexplained by factors in the model?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. And found a four percent pay difference between Asians and Whites?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Is that correct?
A. Looks like -- this explanation look very
strange, you know? Usually we don't explain that way.

You connect the percentage at the Model \(R\) Square and they have a 20 -- about 22 percent, 23 percent not explained, okay, because -- all right, yeah. 22, 23 percent unexplained variations and they have a 4 percent -- okay, yeah, sounds fair.
Q. Okay. And looking down three more lines on the same page 5309 I see "Ethnicity-B"?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Do you understand that to mean Black or

\section*{African-American?}
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And this finds standard deviations of negative 2.10?
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A. Uh-hm, uh-hm. Yes.
Q. And b-Coefficient of negative 0.06, correct?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. So am I right in understanding that the model you ran for product development left 23 percent of pay unexplained by factors in the model and found a 6 percent pay difference between African-American employees and White employees?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you flip through Exhibit 4 to page 5314 ?
A. 5314?
Q. Correct.
A. Okay.
Q. Do pages 5314 and 5315 present the results of your model for the Information Technology job function to assess pay differences between men and women?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And would I -- I don't want to go
through "What does a b-Coefficient mean," "What does SD mean" here if it means the same thing in the pages that we just looked at.
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Do those terms have the same meaning on page 5314 and 5315 that they have in the earlier
pages we were looking at?
A. Yeah -- yes.
Q. Okay. And the b-Coefficient on female, on
page 5314, is negative 0.04 , correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. And that means a four percent pay
difference adverse to women?
A. That's right.
Q. And the R-squared for this model, for the Information Technology job function, was around 84 percent, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And that means 16 percent of the variation in pay is unexplained by factors in the model, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Turning to pages 5317 through 5319, do pages 5317 through 5319 present the results of your model for the product development job function to assess pay differences between men and women?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. And the b-Coefficient on female here is
negative 0.04 , correct?
A. Uh-hm. Uh-hm.
Q. And that means a four percent pay
difference adverse to women?
A. Yes.
Q. And the \(R\) squared of this model, again, is
something like 77 percent, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that means 23 percent of the variation in pay is unexplained by factors in the model?
A. That's right.
Q. Last but not least, in this exhibit,
turning to page 5320. Does page 5320 present the results of your model for the support job function to assess pay differences between men and women?
A. Uh-hm. Between men and women, that's right.
Q. And the b-Coefficient on female here is negative 0.08 percent, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that means on average an 8 percent pay difference adverse to women?
A. That's right.
Q. And the R-squared of this model is around 85 percent, correct?

\section*{Page 262}
A. That's right.
Q. And that means 58 percent of the variation
is unexplained by factors in the model, correct?
A. That's right.

MS. MANTOAN: Would you like another copy of the Federal Contractor Compliance manual?
(Exhibit 14 was marked for identification.)
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Dr. Leu, we've talked at various points
today about the Federal Contract Compliance manual,
and obviously without reading every word of the
lengthy document in front of you, does this look to you like the Federal Contract Compliance manual?
A. Yeah, looks like, yeah.
Q. "Yes"?
A. Uh-hm.
Q. Okay.

MR. ELIASOPH: I don't think I've ever seen it printed out, just for the record.

MS. MANTOAN: Well, now you have your own --

MR. ELIASOPH: There you go.
MS. MANTOAN: -- hard copy.

\section*{BY MS. MANTOAN:}
Q. So I have some questions about the section
related to compensation, which is Section 2L, as in
lion, 03. And that starts on the page numbered 100
in the document.
Can you let me know when you have found that page?
A. Compensation, yeah, okay.
Q. Have you read this section of the -- I'm going to call it "the FCCM"; is that okay?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Do you refer to it as the FCCM in your work?
A. I did read in the 2005 , other than that, I don't have time to --
Q. I see, you read it in --
A. I read in 2005 --
Q. Okay.
A. -- when I get into the job, you know?
Q. I see.
A. Yeah.
Q. You can't -- can you recall reading the

FCCM at any point since 2005?
A. 2005, yeah.
Q. Have you read it since then?
A. No. Just -- if I -- at one time I looked
like I want to see specific reference, right, --
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 Q. Okay. Page 265 & 1 MR. ELIASOPH: Is there a specific reason 267 \\
\hline 1 Q. Okay. & \\
\hline 2 A. -- I open to the specific page and read 3 that. That's it. & 2 you need him to identify whatever passage he looked 3 at once? \\
\hline 4 Q. I see. & 4 MS. MANTOAN: Well, I don't think he \\
\hline 5 A. Yeah. & 5 said -- \\
\hline 6 Q. So you read it cover to cover in 2005, is & 6 MR. ELIASOPH: Do you have -- \\
\hline 7 what you're saying? & 7 MS. MANTOAN: -- he only looked at it once, \\
\hline 8 A. Yeah, yeah. & 8 but I was just trying to get a sense of particularly \\
\hline 9 Q. Okay. But not since? & 9 where in this document he's looked. \\
\hline 10 A. Uh-hm. & 10 MR. ELIASOPH: I think he identified that. \\
\hline 11 Q. Have you looked at this Section 2L03 on & 11 MS. MANTOAN: Okay. \\
\hline 12 compensation at any time since that initial review? & 12 BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 13 A. No. No, since that 2005 I don't see the & 13 Q. So, I do want to look back at the \\
\hline 14 compensation right here, no. & 14 Section 2L03 on compensation. \\
\hline 15 Q. Are there sections of the FCCM that you & 15 A. Okay. \\
\hline 16 have consulted since that initial review? & 16 Q. Appreciating that -- well, let me first \\
\hline 17 A. FCCN (sic) -- what is FCCN? & 17 make sure I understood your testimony. \\
\hline 18 Q. If -- this document (indicating) -- & 18 Your testimony is that Section 2L03 is not \\
\hline 19 A. Uh-hm. & 19 something you've reviewed since your initial look \\
\hline 20 Q. Let's call it "the Manual." Maybe that's & 20 through the manual, correct? \\
\hline 21 easier? & 21 A. That's right. \\
\hline 22 A. Oh, manual. I call manual, okay. & 22 Q. Okay. I do want to ask you a question \\
\hline 23 Q. Are there other specific sections of the & 23 about these three questions that are bullet \\
\hline 24 manual that you have consulted since your initial & 24 pointed -- \\
\hline 25 review? & 25 A. Uh-hm. \\
\hline A. I think I checked the cohort analysis. I Page 266 & 1 Q. Page 268 \\
\hline A. I think I checked the cohort analysis. I & 1 Q. -- here at the bottom of page 100. \\
\hline 2 don't know which page. & 2 A. Uh-hm. \\
\hline 3 Q. The cohort analysis? & 3 Q. Before that the immediately preceding \\
\hline 4 A. I checked -- yeah, I checked it one time & 4 sentence reads: \\
\hline 5 because we have a problem, you know, argue with one & \(5 \quad\) "In every case there are three key \\
\hline 6 of you cohort and then I just want to see the & 6 questions to be answered (sic), an onsite \\
\hline 7 definition of cohort at that time. I don't know & 7 review may provide data or information \\
\hline 8 they have cohort right here. It should have -- it & 8 necessary to answer them." \\
\hline 9 should have cohort right here. & 9 Correct? That's what it says? \\
\hline 10 Q. Are you talking about the definition of & 10 MR. ELIASOPH: The document speaks for \\
\hline 11 cohort analysis -- & 11 itself. \\
\hline 12 A. Yeah, I-- & 12 BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 13 Q. -- near the end of the manual where they & 13 Q. Do you see where I was reading, Dr. Leu? \\
\hline 4 give definitions? & 14 A. You read right here (indicating), right? \\
\hline 15 A. No. They talk about -- I think in the & 15 Q. Right above the bullet points, correct. \\
\hline 16 middle somewhere, they have a cohort analysis, & 16 A. Oh, okay. "In every case," that's where \\
\hline 17 something like that, yeah. & 17 you start to read? \\
\hline 18 Oh, I -- it's this one (indicating), let me & 18 Q. That's right. \\
\hline 19 see. & 19 "In every case there are three key \\
\hline 20 Q. What page? & 20 questions to be addressed, and the on" -- \\
\hline 21 A. No, no, no. This one, it's overview of & 21 I'm sorry. -- "an onsite review may \\
\hline 22 resolution. No. & 22 provide data or information necessary to \\
\hline 23 Yeah, this basically -- most of them is for & 23 answer them." \\
\hline 24 the onsite, for the CO, you know, job, you know, & 24 A. Uh-hm. Okay, onsite, yeah, okay. \\
\hline 25 analysis. Let me see. & 25 Q. So I want to go through these questions and \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & I want to ask you whether in your view your Page 269 & & BY MS. MANTOAN: Page 271 \\
\hline 2 & statistical model answers this question. & 2 & Q. The second question listed here: \\
\hline 3 & So, the first question: & 3 & "Is the difference in compensation between \\
\hline 4 & "Is there a measurable difference in & 4 & comparative employees under the \\
\hline 5 & compensation on the basis of sex, race, or & 5 & contractor's wage or salary system?" \\
\hline 6 & ethnicity?" & 6 & Do you believe that the statistical work \\
\hline 7 & Do you believe that the statistical work & 7 & that you did in connection with the Oracle \\
\hline 8 & that you did in connection with the Oracle & 8 & headquarters' compliance review addresses that \\
\hline 9 & headquarters' compliance review addresses that first & 9 & second question? \\
\hline 10 & question? & 10 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it \\
\hline 11 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it & 11 & calls for a legal conclusion or requires \\
\hline 12 & calls for a legal conclusion or requires & 12 & speculation. \\
\hline 13 & speculation. & 13 & THE WITNESS: This involved -- it depends \\
\hline 4 & THE WITNESS: I think this part usually is & 14 & on how you define, you know, because comparative \\
\hline 15 & for the Oscar -- desk audit investigation, this & 5 & employee -- how you define comparable. \\
\hline 16 & part. & 16 & Comparative is a male compared to the \\
\hline 17 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 17 & female, that's why -- yeah, they say comparative \\
\hline 18 & Q. So -- right, I'm not asking about whether & 18 & employee? Or because they both compare the group \\
\hline 19 & you've used this or who uses it. & & based on the same years they work in the company, \\
\hline 20 & A. Uh-hm. & 20 & and then after that we compare their pay, this or -- \\
\hline 21 & Q. I'm just looking to this -- I'm just asking & 21 & everything is similar, right? Comparative means \\
\hline 2 & you whether you believe that your statistical work & 22 & compared to a similar. \\
\hline 3 & answers this question. Right? & 23 & I don't quite understand here compare \\
\hline 24 & So independent of whether you were asked to & 24 & employee here. \\
\hline 25 & answer that question or -- I'm asking whether it & 25 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. \\
\hline & Page 270 & & Page 272 \\
\hline 1 & does, in your view, in fact answer the question. & 1 & THE WITNESS: It could indicate many \\
\hline 2 & So with that clarification let me ask & 2 & things, you know. \\
\hline 3 & again. & 3 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. That's fine. \\
\hline 4 & A. I should say yes. & 4 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 5 & MR. ELIASOPH: Same objections. & 5 & Q. The third question here on page 100 reads: \\
\hline 6 & THE WITNESS: Objection. & 6 & s there a legitimate explanation for the \\
\hline 7 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 7 & difference?" \\
\hline 8 & Q. Okay. So the -- let me just ask again. & 8 & Do you believe that the statistical work \\
\hline 9 & The first question: & 9 & that you did in connection with the Oracle \\
\hline 10 & "Is there a measurable difference in & 10 & headquarters' compliance review addresses the third \\
\hline 1 & compensation on the basis of sex, race, or & 11 & question? \\
\hline 12 & ethnicity?" & 12 & MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent it \\
\hline 13 & Do you believe that the statistical work & 13 & calls for a legal conclusion or requires \\
\hline 14 & that you did in connection with the Oracle & 14 & speculation. \\
\hline 15 & headquarters' compliance review addresses that first & 15 & THE WITNESS: If -- okay, if the data is \\
\hline 16 & question? & 16 & accurate and the assumption is not serious \\
\hline 7 & MR. ELIASOPH: And objection to the extent & 17 & violations I would say there is a legitimate \\
\hline 8 & it calls for a legal conclusion or speculation. & 18 & explanation for the difference. \\
\hline 9 & THE WITNESS: So I don't need to answer & 19 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 0 & this question? & 20 & Q. What do you mean "if the assumption is not \\
\hline 1 & MR. ELIASOPH: You do need to. & 21 & seriously violated"? \\
\hline 22 & THE WITNESS: Okay. & 22 & A. Like, you know, in the beginning I talk \\
\hline 23 & I will say yes. & 23 & about, like the constant variance, you know, within \\
\hline 4 & MS. MANTOAN: Okay. & 24 & the pool -- \\
\hline & //I & 25 & Q. Yes. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Page 273 & & Page 275 \\
\hline & A. -- appearance group. & 1 & situated where it is reasonable to expect \\
\hline 2 & Q. Uh-hm. & 2 & that they should be receiving equivalent \\
\hline 3 & A. And also they don't have the data, the & 3 & compensation absent discrimination." \\
\hline 4 & observation independent. & 4 & Have you ever received any training or \\
\hline 5 & Q. Yes. & 5 & direction from anyone at the department of labor on \\
\hline 6 & A. Okay. And there why is -- their & 6 & the circumstances in which it is reasonable to \\
\hline 7 & stribution is kind of normal -- normal & 7 & xpect that two employees should be receiving \\
\hline 8 & stribution. These the three main assumptions -- & 8 & equivalent compensation absent discrimination? \\
\hline 9 & hey meet or are not serious violations, right, & 9 & A. I have that similar type of training, but I \\
\hline 10 & sually we can say that the result can be a & 10 & annot recall exactly what time, you know. That's \\
\hline 11 & gitimate explanation for the difference. Right? & 11 & ng time ago, maybe ten years ago, when I get \\
\hline 12 & Q. What are you understanding the word & 12 & into -- first time I get into the OFCCP. \\
\hline 13 & "legitimate" to mean there? & 13 & Okay, so "where it is reasonable to expect \\
\hline 14 & A. Yeah, okay. This is a legal name, right? & & at they should be receiving". \\
\hline 15 & Legitimate is a legal name? & 15 & No, this question is too vague -- you know, \\
\hline 16 & Q. I don't know how you're using it. You're & 16 & it's vague for me. \\
\hline 17 & answering the question and sol presume you're & 17 & MR. ELIASOPH: Do you want to take -- \\
\hline 18 & answering it with some understanding -- & 18 & Can we take a short break? \\
\hline 19 & A. Legitimate is -- okay, is it reasonable? & 19 & MS. MANTOAN: Sure. \\
\hline 20 & MR. ELIASOPH: I'm going to object that & 20 & THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the \\
\hline & it's vague and the witness is not clear as to what's & & cord. \\
\hline 22 & being asked. & 22 & The time is 4:58 p.m. \\
\hline 23 & THE WITNESS: It's not very clear for me, & 23 & (Short recess was taken from 4:58 p.m. \\
\hline 24 & you know. & 24 & until 5:00 p.m.) \\
\hline 25 & Legitimate is reasonable, is not logically & 25 & THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the \\
\hline & Page 274 & & Page 276 \\
\hline & set up, or is it related -- I don't know legitimate. & & record. \\
\hline 2 & So is legally, or whatever? So it's kind of vague & 2 & The time is 5:00 p.m. \\
\hline 3 & for me, you know, here. Yeah, it's kind of vague & 3 & THE WITNESS: Yes. \\
\hline & for me to answer this legitimate explanation. & 4 & BY MS. MANTOAN: \\
\hline 5 & I just know, you know, based on those & 5 & Q. So, Dr. Leu, we're still on page 102, \\
\hline 6 & assumptions are not seriously violated, right, then & 6 & Exhibit -- \\
\hline 7 & I know they have 70 percent, 75 percent explanation & 7 & A. Okay. \\
\hline 8 & of the model, right, but sometime, you know -- in & 8 & Q. -- 14. And we were looking at the \\
\hline 9 & some article they say "Oh, 75 probably not enough to & 9 & paragraph that starts "For purposes of evaluating \\
\hline 10 & say it's not legitimate." & 10 & compensation differences"... \\
\hline 11 & So I don't know how you define for & 11 & And the second sentence there says, \\
\hline 12 & legitimate right here, how -- you know, how they & 12 & "Relevant factors in determining similarity may \\
\hline 13 & fine legitimate explanation right here. It could & 13 & include," and my question for you is just going to \\
\hline 4 & be wild, it could be narrow, it can be -- that can & & whether or not you evaluated each of these -- the \\
\hline 15 & be this, you know. It's not -- it's not easy -- I & 15 & xtent to which each of these factors were the same \\
\hline 16 & cannot explain this one. & 16 & r differed among employees at Oracle, okay? \\
\hline 17 & BY MS. MANTOAN: & 17 & So, did you evaluate whether the tasks \\
\hline 18 & Q. Okay. Let's turn over to page 102, please. & 18 & erformed by different employees at Oracle were -- \\
\hline 19 & A. Uh-hm. & 19 & strike. \\
\hline 20 & Q. So the first full paragraph there starts & 20 & Did you evaluate the extent of similarity \\
\hline 21 & with the words "For purposes." Do you see that? & 21 & of the tasks performed by different employees at \\
\hline 22 & A. Uh-hm. & 22 & Oracle? \\
\hline 23 & Q. Okay. And it reads: & 23 & A. No. \\
\hline 24 & "For purposes of evaluating compensation & 24 & Q. Did you evaluate the extent of similarity \\
\hline 25 & differences, employees are similarly & & of the skills of different employees at Oracle? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
A. No.
Q. Did you evaluate the extent of similarity of the effort exerted by different employees at Oracle?

MR. ELIASOPH: I'm just going to object for the record that -- that Mr. Leu has already given detailed testimony that this was not part of his function; that these questions have been asked and answered.

MS. MANTOAN: So I think related questions have been, but it shouldn't take too long to go through this list, and I do think that I'm entitled to go through this list.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So did you evaluate the extent of similarity of the effort exerted by different employees at Oracle?

MR. ELIASOPH: I'll just have a standing objection.

MS. MANTOAN: That's fine.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. Did you evaluate the extent of similarity of the level of responsibility held by different employees at Oracle?
A. No.
Q. Did you evaluate the extent of similarity
of the working conditions of different employees at
Oracle?
A. No.
Q. Did you evaluate the extent of similarity
of job difficulty for different employees at Oracle?
A. No.
Q. Did you evaluate the minimum qualifications required for any specific position at Oracle?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Did your statistical models of

Oracle's headquarters' location include any controls
for performance?
MR. ELIASOPH: Objection to the extent you're discussing models that have not been produced. Those would be deliberative.

So don't answer -- I don't believe it's on
this report.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So did the statistical analysis reflected
in Exhibit 2 contain any controls to differentiate employees based on performance?
A. Exhibit 2?
Q. Exhibit 2, Attachment A, correct, which I
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1
think we've established is the same analysis as is
in Exhibit 4.
A. And what's your questions?
Q. Did the statistical analysis reflected in

Exhibit 2, Attachment A, contain any controls to differentiate employees based on performance?
A. None that I know.

MS. MANTOAN: Short break?
MR. ELIASOPH: Sure.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record.

The time is 5:04 p.m.
(Short recess was taken from 5:04 p.m.
until 5:09 p.m.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record.

The time is 5:09 p.m.
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So, Dr. Leu, I did want to have the
reporter mark as Exhibit 15 the diagram that you
drew when you were explaining work experience prior to Oracle.

I'm just going to take a pause here and ask her to mark that and then I'll have you confirm so the record is clear that that is what that is.
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(Exhibit 15 marked for identification.)
BY MS. MANTOAN:
Q. So you've been handed what's been marked as Exhibit 15, Dr. Leu. Is that a diagram that you drew earlier today when you were explaining how you constructed the work experience prior to Oracle variable in your statistical model?
A. Yes.

MS. MANTOAN: Okay. So I do not have any further questions at this time.

We've discussed a couple of different issues on the record, things we were going to confer about, and there were a number of privileged instructions so I'm going to leave the deposition open pending discussion of -- and any resolution of those issues, but other than that, I don't have further questions today.

MR. ELIASOPH: I have no questions.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes the deposition for today.

We are now off the record. The time is
5:10 p.m.
THE REPORTER: Mr. Eliasoph, this has been expedited, would you like your copy at the same time?
protected to order it expedited, so whatever the standard has been.
Do I have your card?
THE REPORTER: Ill give you one. MS. JAMES: And just to confirm, you will send us the rough tonight?

THE REPORTER: Yes. You saw it. It's rough, but I will send it.

MS. JAMES: That's fine. And the final will be expedited --

THE REPORTER: Yes, expedited for Friday.
MS. JAMES: Great. Thank you.
(The deposition of SHIRONG "ANDY" LEU was concluded at 5:10 p.m.)
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Case Name: OFCCP vs. Oracle America, Inc.
Name of Witness: Shirong Andy Leu
Date of Deposition: 07/01/2019
Job No.: 10057521
Reason Codes: 1. To clarify the record.
2. To conform to the facts.
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[^0]:    Page 29
    A. I was in Gateway Computer. And, you know,

    I went there, I applied, but they don't have job for
    me so -- but I think I have to leave.
    Q. So did you work -- I'm sorry, did you work there or you just applied to work there?
    A. I worked there -- eventually I worked
    there.
    Q. So I'm asking about the first job after you completed your Ph.D. in 1994.
    A. Yes, in -- like a -- Gateway Computer.
    Q. Okay. What year did you start at Gateway Computer?
    A. Technical support.
    Q. And in what year did you start?
    A. Looks like 1996, uh-hm.
    Q. So what did you do between 1994 and 1996
    for employment, if anything?
    A. I -- basically I went to the -- I went to

    New England, the Institute of -- Institute of
    Medical Science.
    I trained in Tufts University between
    those -- year before I went to the Gateway. And
    it's kind of the -- the program is epidemiology --
    Q. Epidemiology?
    A. -- training.

    Yes. In the Tufts University.
    Q. Did that -- did that result in any degree?
    A. It's not degree. It's just kind of
    training, you know, and they give you a certificate, you know, something like that.
    Q. Did you complete the program at Tufts?
    A. Yeah. Yeah. It's kind of related public health, yeah, public health.
    Q. Was there any particular public health
    issue that was the focus of your work in the program at Tufts?
    A. No, not that I recall.
    Q. Okay. So if I understand correctly, you completed that program at Tufts in 1996 and then you went to work at Gateway Computer in technical support?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Was the technical support role you had at

    Gateway Computer from -- supporting other Gateway
    Computer employees or was it supporting external customers of Gateway Computer?
    A. External customer.
    Q. Would they call in with questions and you
    would answer those on the phone?
    A. That's correct, yes.

